

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Is it still possible to pray for rain?

There are those who tell us it is possible still but it will not be possible long. It is possible still, they say, because the laws which govern the weather are not all ascertained yet. But they are being gradually discovered. And when they are all discovered we shall be able to predict the rain as certainly as we predict an eclipse of the sun. Then it will not be possible to pray for rain.

Mr. S. A. McDOWALL, in his new book on *Evolution and Spiritual Life* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 6s. net), discusses the possibility of prayer for rain. He does not use that argument. He sees some difficulties in the way of prayer for rain. But they have nothing to do with the laws of nature. They are not scientific; they are philosophical, as are all the problems that we are now most perplexed with.

Some things are clear. It is clear that our mind affects our body—influences and modifies it directly. It is also clear that our mind *may* mediate a change in matter outside our own body. Whereupon a third thing is clear—that no distinction can be drawn between answers to prayer involving mind and answers to prayer involving matter.

But there are two kinds of matter. There is matter which is animated by mind, and there is matter which is not animated by mind. We may be able to influence the body of another because it is animated by its own mind. Can we also influence the clouds which are not so animated? We may by prayer be able to raise another from a bed of sickness. Can we also darken the sky with clouds and bring down rain on the thirsty land?

The answer is that we should never dream of such a thing. It is not to the clouds we pray, any more than it is to our sick friend's body. It is to God, the healer of the one, the upholder of the other. Mr. McDOWALL sticks to matter, because, to his philosophical mind, matter is God's self-limitation. 'Without irreverence,' he calls it 'the material Body of the Immanent God' and says that it 'constitutes part of His immediate experience.' To interfere with the rain is therefore to interfere with the will of God which originally brought about the self-limitation.

Well, after all, he comes to the will of God, as we must always come. It is not whether we can influence matter, with or without mind, directly or indirectly. That is not prayer. It is whether we can influence the will of God. If prayer cannot do that, it can do nothing. If it can do that, it can do all things.

Now it is impossible to see how prayer can influence the will of God. But it is quite certain that it does so. What do we mean by influencing God's will? We possibly mean no more, but we certainly mean no less, than that which the Syro-phenician woman accomplished with the will of Christ. To say that that woman did not influence the will of Christ is to say that 'He was pretending all the time.' Why it had to be done, we cannot tell. Nor can we tell how she did it, except that she did it by the greatness of her faith. But so it is always. 'Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do what is done to the fig tree, but even if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou taken up and cast into the sea, it shall be done. And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive' (Mt 21^{21, 22}).

Professor E. A. SONNENSCHN, of the University of Birmingham, is not content with the Golden Rule as men understand it. He is quite content with it as he understands it himself. But he has been asking his friends how they understand it—'several clergymen and laymen'—and they have all given him the same answer. They do not understand it aright.

It is only recently that Professor SONNENSCHN came to understand it aright himself. For over half a century he misunderstood it. He is astonished at himself. He is astonished at the whole Christian world. For nearly two thousand years, he says, we have been preoccupied with the subject, and we do not understand it yet.

The Golden Rule is given in the Gospels twice. It is given by St. Matthew (7¹²) in this form: 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.' And it is given by St. Luke (6³¹) in this form: 'As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.' It seems very easily understood. But the meaning which Professor SONNENSCHN took out of it for more than fifty

years, and which all his friends take out of it still, is wrong. That meaning is that we are bidden to do to others what we should wish them to do to us, if our positions were reversed; that is to say, if we were in their place and they in ours. And that is not the right meaning.

That could not be the right meaning. For look how it would work out. 'A beggar in the street asks me for money: I ought to give it, because I, if I were in the same situation, should wish another person so to behave towards me, and my hypothetical wish is an index of the wishes of the beggar. An *employé* asks for a rise in his wages: I ought to grant it, because his wish is only what I myself should wish in the same circumstances. An enemy country wishes that we should not make energetic efforts to repel its attacks: we ought to abstain, because if our positions were reversed there is nothing that we should desire more than inactivity on the part of *our* enemies.'

Did Christ teach that? Professor SONNENSCHN has no hesitation in answering that He did not. The last example settles it. There are three examples, the beggar, the *employé*, and the enemy. At an earlier period in our national life the example that would have settled it would have been the beggar. At a later period the *employé*. But at the present time the example that settles it is the enemy. It is inconceivable to Professor SONNENSCHN that our Lord should have asked the Belgians to lie low and let the Germans pass through their country to the conquest of France.

The misunderstanding, says Professor SONNENSCHN, is due to the English translation. And if Professor SONNENSCHN had done nothing else by his article in the *Hibbert Journal* for July than draw our attention to the English word that has caused the misunderstanding, he would still have rendered us a considerable service. For we have no idea, any of us, how greatly we are at the mercy of the English of our Bible, or how disas-

trously. The Revisers had a chance to help us. They did not take it. Possibly they did not see the necessity. It is not that the Greek or the Hebrew is mistranslated in the Authorized Version. It is not so often mistranslated as we think. Nor is it that certain words used in that version are now quite obsolete and unintelligible to us. It is that ever so many words have changed their meaning and we do not observe it. We pass over them unsuspectingly, and misunderstand the import of the whole passage or precept. That is what has happened with the Golden Rule.

The word is *would*. 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you.' That 'would,' says Professor SONNENSCHN, suggests an 'if' coming after it. It is a conditional. We say in our minds, 'Whatsoever ye would, if ye were in their place.' But it is not a conditional. At the time when the Authorized Version was made it was a simple indicative. It stood for 'whatsoever ye wish.' It was a legitimate and accurately idiomatic translation of the words in the Greek, whether those words are St. Matthew's (ὅσα ἂν θέλητε) or St. Luke's (καθὼς θέλετε).

There is no question of putting ourselves in the place of some one else. It is 'whatsoever we desire' in our own place. And what do we desire? Speaking generally, we desire good. We desire good in our own place, as we are; and the higher we are the truer is the good we desire. We do not desire that which the mendicant desires, which is probably not good for him and is certainly not good for us. We do not desire that which the workman desires, which may or may not be good for him, but is certainly not good for us if we are not workmen. And we do not desire that which the enemy desires, free passage through our country. Such free passage may be good for the enemy demanding it; we do not believe that it is for our good; and we know that it is not for the good of the world.

Was the Apostle Thomas a doubter?

It is not very many years since the question would have been received with ridicule. Of course he was a doubter. What else was he?

Then Tennyson wrote: 'There lives more faith in honest doubt, believe me, than in half the creeds.' Whereupon there came a revolution in men's minds concerning the Apostle Thomas. He might still be a doubter, but he 'doubted well.'

He doubted well. The phrase is Plato's. The present Bishop of London found it there and applied it to Thomas. There are doubters who do not doubt well. There is the indifferent (and probably supercilious) doubter; and there is the superficial self-satisfied doubter. Thomas was not an indifferent doubter. 'I remember,' says the Bishop of London, 'talking to a nice young fellow in Bethnal Green. "Well, now," I said, "what do you think about religion?" "Well, Mr. Ingram," he replied, "to tell you the truth, I never think of it from one end of the year to the other." "He was a Bethnal Green boy," continues the Bishop, "hardly grown up. We cannot blame him; he was never brought up to anything better, but we taught him something better later on.'

That is very likely. For the indifferent doubter is not so difficult to teach as is the superficial talkative doubter. Bacon says: 'A little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism; but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds round about to religion.' The superficial talking doubter has often a little philosophy, but he rarely proceeds to depth in it. He has no time; so much has he to say about his atheism. He has no inclination; so satisfied is he to have a little philosophy—the greater number have none.

The indifferent doubter and the superficial doubter are both dishonest, the one with himself, the other with us. There is also the honest doubter. And now we are all agreed that if Thomas was a doubter at all, he was an honest doubter. Why was he an honest doubter? Some

say that he doubted with the head while his heart was right. Others say that he doubted with the heart, while his head was right. And some say that he doubted with head and heart both; but he was an honest doubter still.

He doubted with his head. So says ROBERTSON of Brighton. 'There is a class of men,' he says, 'whose reflective powers are stronger than their susceptible: they think out truth—they do not feel it out. Often highly gifted and powerful minds, they cannot rest till they have made all their grounds certain: they do not feel safe as long as there is one possibility of delusion left: they prove all things. Such a man was Thomas. He has well been called the rationalist among the apostles.'

He doubted with his heart. So says Dr. J. D. JONES. 'The doubt of Thomas,' he says, 'sprang not from his head, but from his heart; it was the result not of intellectual difficulty, but of great sorrow. There is no analogy or kinship, therefore, between the doubt of Thomas and the speculative doubt of our own day, caused as that is by intellectual and philosophical difficulties. If you want to find the true analogy to this despair of Thomas, visit some home where "in the shadow of a great affliction a soul sits dumb."'

And he doubted with both head and heart. So says Dr. A. H. DRYSDALE. He says: 'If we read his idiosyncrasy aright, there was in him a special sort of twin-nature: both a masculine and a feminine element; a keen intellect combined with a tender and delicate susceptibility, not often found together, save in exceptionally gifted souls. For Thomas was not a hard and cold being, like many in whom the critical faculty predominates. There are those in whom emotion is stronger than their understanding, who are led by feeling more than by thinking, and simple even to credulity—ready to believe to the verge of superstition; on the other hand, there are some whose reflective powers are much greater than their emotional nature and who are apt to be somewhat apathetic therefore,

or aloof in their attachments. To neither of these classes does Thomas belong, or rather he combines both of them in himself in rare and unusual proportions.'

Now, it may not be easy to reconcile all these ideas. But there are contradictions in most of us, and the science of psychology is yet in its infancy. About one thing, however, all the interpreters of Thomas are agreed, and it is the essential thing. With all his doubting, he never wavered in his loyalty. He loved Jesus from the first, and he loved Him to the last. Then let his doubt be of the head or of the heart or of the whole personality, it went down at last before the rush of the river of his affection. It was Thomas who gave John the word he was waiting for, and enabled him to bring his Gospel to an end.

But no sooner had men discovered that Thomas doubted well than some of them began to go a step beyond, and wonder if he doubted at all. Some of the most recent preachers who have preached and published on Thomas believe that a great injustice is done to him in calling him a doubter. It is an injustice from which he has suffered far too long, they say, and they use strong language to do away with it.

Why was he ever called a doubter? Plainly because he doubted the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. He said, 'Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe.'

'But we have to remember,' says Dr. ADENEY, 'that he was the only one who had not seen the risen Christ. For anything we know to the contrary, if he had been present, he would have been convinced; and, for anything we know to the contrary, if any one of the others had been absent, that disciple would have been equally sceptical. As it is, none of them had believed the reports of previous appearances. What the women said

appeared to them all but idle tales, and the appearance to Peter had only filled the rest with perplexity. It was Christ's appearance to them that convinced the eleven; on the next occasion, Thomas being present, he too was convinced.'

The force of this is undeniable. If Thomas had been present on the first appearance of Jesus to the Eleven, he might have been as firmly convinced of the reality of the resurrection as any of them. But that only throws the objection back a step. Why was he not there? Dr. ADENEY answers that we cannot tell. And that is quite true. But we can conjecture.

Now it is a curious circumstance that whenever men began to conjecture why Thomas 'was not with them,' they found that it would not do to say, 'Because he was a doubter.' They were all doubters regarding the resurrection, and there could be no difference of degree of doubt among them, so absolute was it all round. When He did appear, they were all amazed; and again you could not tell which of them was most amazed. If doubt of the resurrection kept Thomas away, nobody would have been present. Why then was Thomas not with them?

The answer introduces us to a new opinion about Thomas. He was not with them because he was a pessimist. So say many expositors and preachers. Some say that he was a pessimist because he was a doubter. Some say that he was a doubter because he was a pessimist. And some say that he was only a pessimist and not properly a doubter at all. But they all say that the real reason why he was not with the rest of the apostles on their first meeting with Jesus was that, being of a melancholy temperament, he was utterly cast down by what had happened, and had gone away to brood over his sorrow alone.

Some preachers draw impressive pictures of Thomas in his solitude. But they draw them of their own imagination. There is no evidence.

The reason why they call in their imagination so confidently is that they have already discovered the pessimist in another event. It is the event of the raising of Lazarus from the dead. Jesus had retired from Jerusalem when the message came that Lazarus was sick. And when He intimated to the disciples His intention of returning to its neighbourhood, they were not a little alarmed. 'Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee, and goest thou thither again?' And when He persisted, it was Thomas who said to his fellow-disciples, 'Let us also go, that we may die with him.'

Whereupon Prebendary CALTHROP speaks of his 'despondent character' and 'what we may perhaps call his pessimistic bias'; and Dr. George MATHESON tells us that 'there are two classes of minds which habitually stand in the post of outlook—the man of the laurel and the man of the cypress. The first sees the world as rose-coloured. It is all brightness, all beauty, all glory—a scene of splendid possibilities which is waiting to open for him its gates of gold. The second, on the other hand, approaches it with dismay. To him the prospect looks all dark. He is a pessimist previous to experience. He is sure he will never succeed. He is sure the gate will not open when he tries it. He feels that he has nothing to expect from life. He hangs his harp upon a willow, and goes forth to sow in tears.'

Of these two classes the man of the laurel in the New Testament is John; the man of the cypress is Thomas. 'He came to the facts of life with an antecedent prejudice; he uniformly expected from the banquet an inferior menu. It is a great mistake to imagine that the collapse came with the Crucifixion. Strictly speaking, there was no collapse. If I understand the picture aright, it represents the figure of a man who could never stand at his full stature but was always bent towards the ground. It was not from timidity. He was a courageous man, ready to do and dare anything, even when he was most downcast. It was not

from a mean nature. He was a man of the noblest spirit—capable of the most heroic deeds of sacrifice. That which gave him a crouching attitude was simply a constitutional want of hope—a natural inability to take the bright view.’

But the most recent expositors will have none of it. Dr. ADENEY, whom we have already named, rejects the whole pessimistic hypothesis. He says it is unfair to find pessimism in the words, ‘Let us also go, that we may die with him.’ ‘Is there any evidence,’ he asks, ‘that the other disciples were a particle more hopeful? Nay, as regards the matter of his saying, was Jesus Himself more hopeful? Jesus had told His friends before this that He would have to die when He went up to Jerusalem. Thomas takes no more gloomy a view of the situation than his Master had taken. Indeed, he simply accepts Christ’s own prediction, and bases his proposal upon it. And he was right in his anticipation.’

If Thomas was neither a doubter nor a despairer, what was he? Says Professor GWATKIN: ‘He was just what some of our triflers would like to be thought—a sober truthful man who insists on facing the facts he sees before he goes a step further. Such a man is slow to move: no passing enthusiasm can stir him, only the gravest sense of duty. And faith is none the worse for counting the cost before it gives itself to Christ.’

Has Christianity broken down? With the exception of Turkey and Japan, the nations that are engaged in the present war are Christian nations. They are fighting fiercely for the mastery. Some of them are perpetrating atrocities for which it is difficult to find a parallel in all the history of the world. Has Christianity broken down?

The answer, as they say in the House of Commons, is in the negative. No doubt, if the nations that are engaged in the war are Christian nations, Christianity is a failure. But *are* they

Christian? When is a nation properly to be called a Christian nation? We may say perhaps when a majority of the members of it are Christians. Is a majority of the people of Germany Christian? Or of Britain? Not in any of the countries engaged in the war can it be claimed that a majority of the inhabitants make even an outward profession of Christianity. It cannot therefore be said that because so many so-called Christian nations are engaged in fierce fighting Christianity has broken down. They are not Christian.

But even if a majority in each country were to be found to profess Christianity, would the nations at war prove the failure of the religion of Christ? Are all those who profess Christianity Christians? What *is* a Christian?

The answer is found in three sentences of the Apostle Paul. The first sentence is: ‘Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; but the keeping of the commandments of God’ (1 Co 7¹⁹). The second is: ‘For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love’ (Gal 5⁶). And the third is: ‘For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature’ (Gal 6¹⁵). The answer to the question, What is a Christian? is not found in one of these texts alone. It is found when the three texts are taken together.

In each passage St. Paul states, first of all, certain things which do not prove a man to be a Christian. But we shall pass these by for the present. Our question is, What does prove a man to be a Christian? And the answer of the first text is startling enough to arrest attention. St. Paul’s answer is, ‘The keeping of the commandments of God.’

And it is the answer of Christ Himself. When the young ruler came running and kneeling, ‘Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?’ Christ’s answer was, ‘Keep the com-

mandments.' For indeed no other answer can be given. If we keep the commandments of God then are we right with God. He asks no other of us, or can ask. And it is of no moment to inquire, What are the commandments? Any commandments will do, if they are God's. The commandments you are familiar with. 'Thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not commit adultery; honour thy father and thy mother'—those will do. Or, if you prefer it, the summary of the commandments so memorably expressed by one of the prophets, when he said, 'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?'

But who has done it? In the Westminster Shorter Catechism there is a question which runs: 'Is any man able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God?' And the answer is, 'No mere man since the fall is able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God; but doth daily break them, in thought, word, and deed.'

Perhaps you do not take your theology from the Shorter Catechism. Perhaps you do not think that it is orthodox theology. It may not be orthodox theology; but it is orthodox practice. For what is orthodoxy? Is it not the theology or the practice of the majority? And here not merely is the majority with the Shorter Catechism, everybody is with it. There is no minority. Once there was for a moment a minority of one. The young ruler said, 'All these have I kept from my youth up.' But in another moment he was undeceived. Jesus took the eighth commandment, 'Thou shalt not steal,' and showed him that he had not kept it, and could not keep it, unless he sold all that he had and gave to the poor.

There is no way of keeping the commandments of God except by misunderstanding them. It is probable, although we know of only one actual case, that in the time of our Lord there were not a

few who thought they had kept them all from their youth up. It was for this reason that He delivered the Sermon on the Mount. For what is the Sermon on the Mount from first to last but an explanation of what is meant by keeping the commandments? 'He that looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.'

In our day the attitude is different. No one with the Sermon on the Mount in his hands is hardy enough to say, 'All these have I kept from my youth up.' The attitude now is that we cannot be expected to keep them, that something less than keeping must be sufficient, and that if we do justly and love mercy and walk humbly with our God *in a measure* all is bound to be well with us.

But how can God accept a partial obedience? How can He have fellowship with the half saint who is half a sinner? How can He wink at the breaking of the everlasting laws of righteousness, upon which the very universe is hung, and of which all the commandments are but intelligible expressions? Eternal life is nothing if it is not walking with God; and as somebody asks very pointedly, 'Can two walk together except they be agreed?' We had better accept it at once, however it go against the natural man in us, that to be right with God we must keep the commandments in the sense of the Sermon on the Mount, that is to say, by being 'perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect.' Whereupon we are bound to admit that we cannot do it.

What then? Then begins the Gospel. For let it now be confessed that there is no Gospel, no Christ, and no Christianity in anything that we have yet said. It is all out of the Old Testament. It is all law. Even the summary of the commandments, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself,' incomparable as it is, and accepted by our Lord, is taken from the Old Testament. Christianity begins when we turn from the first sentence quoted

from St. Paul to the second. What is it that proves a man to be a Christian? It is 'faith working through love.'

Now in that answer we are arrested at once by the introduction of a person. For you cannot have faith in a thing. Who is that person? It is the Lord Jesus Christ. To be a Christian is to have faith in Christ. And if there are more kinds of faith than one, it is to have that kind of faith which works through love. For the keeping of the commandments still holds. It is not Christianity, but it is accepted by Christ. As He said, He came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it. Christianity is faith in Christ to the keeping of the commandments, the way of keeping them being through love.

Let us take the sum of the commandments as Christ accepted it: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself.' How does faith in Christ make us able to do that? By the offer of Christ Himself. Is He worth loving? Faith tells us that. It tells us what He has done for us. It offers Him to us as He is. We put ourselves among the 'lost' whom He came to seek and to save; we turn for salvation to Him; and at that very moment He meets us with His 'Son, daughter, be of good cheer, thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.' Whereupon we see Him as He is, altogether worthy of our love and waiting for it. We love Him, because He first loved us.

Now in loving Christ we love both God and man. As He said, 'He that loveth me, loveth my Father also.' And as we may say, turning other words of His round a little, 'Inasmuch as ye do it unto me, ye do it unto the least of these my brethren.' And what is this but to keep the com-

mandments? For the sum of the commandments (let us say it again) is, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself.'

This, then, is the Christian, and there is no other. He keeps the commandments. Not in the Old Testament sense of striving to love God with all his heart and his neighbour as himself, and ever failing ignominiously. Still less in the pharisaic sense of taking the commandments one by one and saying, 'All these have I kept,' though there is no emotion of love to God or man in the heart. Such was the elder son of the parable, rude with his father and contemptuous towards his brother. The Christian keeps the commandments because he loves Christ who is both God and man. And he loves Christ because he has rested upon Him alone for salvation.

And such a Christian is a new creature. That is St. Paul's third statement. We call him so, using this very English word. But the English word does not express exactly what the Apostle said. He said 'a new creation.' For that faith which worketh by love is more than a transfiguration. In all outward reflexion, however great the glory reflected, there is the element of instability. The glory of the Christian is not a glory that passes away, as was the glory that blazed in the face of Moses when he came down from the mount. It is more than a transfiguration. It is a creation. As at the beginning God saw all things which He had created, and said, 'Very good'; so now He sees us in our shield and looks upon us in the face of His anointed, and although we still fail of the keeping of many of the commandments taken by themselves, He sees no iniquity in us. We are a new creation, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, and once more He is able to regard His own handiwork, and to say, 'Very good.'

Jesus' Teaching and Modern Thought.

By REV. CAVENDISH MOXON, M.A., RECTOR OF MARSKE, YORKSHIRE.

WHAT is the effect of modern thought upon our estimate and use of the teaching of Jesus? That is the question which we must attempt to answer. Our knowledge of the methods, debates, and results of modern thought, forces us once more to ask, 'What think ye of Christ' and of His words? In any case, both the friends and the foes of Christianity are urging us to look this difficult problem in the face. On the one hand, there are teachers who say that the teaching of Jesus may be ideal, but is wildly unpractical and quite useless for this present world, which is unready for the Christian anarchy that Tolstoy sees in the gospel of Jesus.¹

Other writers, like Sir Francis Younghusband in a recent issue of the *Hibbert Journal*, declare that the ethics of Jesus are imperfect and already superseded by the judgments of modern ethical teachers. On the other hand, there are some writers who doubt much of the doctrine about Christ and yet ask us to make Jesus our sole Master and His words our final authority. The liberal theologian, Professor E. Ménégoz, for instance, asks us to separate carefully the words of Jesus from the words of His disciples, and then to make the former our basis for faith and practice. Whatever in Christian doctrine does not conform to this pattern of sound words as uttered by Jesus must be rejected as contrary to His Spirit and will.

In view of this conflict of opinion we are inevitably led to inquire what exactly is the authority and worth of Jesus' teaching for us who accept the new knowledge as a divine gift. But before we can answer this question we must state briefly how our view of Jesus Himself and of His recorded words has been modified by modern thought.

Before the rise of modern criticism the whole of Jesus' teaching possessed, in theory at least, an almost unquestioned authority on the minds and consciences of His followers. Vast superstructures of dogma, organization, ceremony, and precept were reared by the Church on the foundation of a few texts. But modern thought has made the ancient methods of building doctrines for ever impossible.

It has caused a serious unsettlement of the very textual foundations upon which some of the ancient and modern dogmas have been built by the Church. We can no longer use all the reported words of Jesus as sure bases for the erection of eternal truths of fact and of obligation. It is now well known that the comparative study of the Gospels has revealed serious discrepancies of both matter and form in the different records of the same sayings of Jesus. It is generally agreed that Mark is the earliest of our Gospels, and that both Matthew and Luke used Mark in a form which was nearly, if not quite, the same as our copy of Mark. This result is important for our present inquiry, because it enables us to see for ourselves the free way in which Matthew and Luke ventured to edit the sayings of Jesus which they borrowed from Mark. These evangelists did not scruple to omit some phrases that offended their taste and to alter other sayings for various practical and religious reasons. It is surprising to observe, for instance, how Matthew deals with Mark's version of our Lord's question to the rich young man who came to consult Him. By changing 'Why callest thou me good?' into 'Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?' Matthew robs the sentence of its original sense and even fails to make the new phrase fit in its old surroundings. We need not doubt that it was the evangelists' desire to be reverent and edifying that led them to handle so freely their Master's teaching. We may even concede that some of the N.T. writers were inspired to express the spirit of Jesus' teaching in forms that are more congenial to our thought than the Galilean mode of speech could be. Still, the fact remains that their discrepant accounts of Jesus' words make it very difficult to ascertain exactly what He said. Since Matthew and Luke are known to have dealt very freely with their Markan material, it is probable that Mark in his turn dealt just as freely with the oral or written traditions he had received. It is evident that Mark was interested in the miracle stories rather than in the teaching connected with the gospel; and on the earliest possible date for Mark there was time for inaccuracies to arise in the trans-

¹ The school of General von Bernhardi in Germany.

mission of Jesus' sayings from mouth to mouth. And if we feel uncertain about the accuracy of Mark and its sources, we feel still more uncertain about the accuracy of the records of Jesus' words in our latest Gospel according to St. John, whoever its author may have been. Both the form and the matter of Jesus' teaching are here so different from the earliest traditions that we are not justified in using any saying in John as evidence of what Jesus said or taught unless it is supported by sayings in the earlier Gospels.

The conclusion to which modern study of the Gospels points may be stated thus. We can in no instance feel certain that we have an absolutely exact record of what Jesus said, and therefore we must not attempt to make the words of Jesus the sole basis for modern Christianity. It is highly probable, however, that many of His sayings and parables are so far correctly reported as to enable us to see His meaning and to gain a clear idea of the main points and principles of His teaching.

Now if, as I believe, modern scholars have succeeded in sifting out many authentic sayings of Jesus from those which the Church has put into His mouth; if we know, at least in part, what Jesus taught about God, man, Himself, religion, the present and the future life, then we are prepared to ask the further question: How, in the light of modern knowledge, does this teaching affect our estimate of Jesus Himself?

In order to paint the old orthodox picture of Christ, the Church used all the materials in the four Gospels. The question now is this, What sort of picture of Jesus can we make when we can no longer use the high colours of the Fourth Gospel, but must use only the well-sifted traditions of the Synoptists for our portrait? The chief difference between the old picture of Jesus and the new is our frank recognition of the limitations in Jesus as He is conceived by the methods of modern thought. We no longer suppose that when Jesus made inquiries or showed surprise about matters of fact He only feigned ignorance for the sake of His hearers. The recent study of the apocalyptic and eschatological teaching of Jesus has made it probable that our Lord's knowledge was more limited than used to be supposed by writers like Bishop Gore.

It is impossible now to review in full the evidence that has convinced many of us that Jesus shared some of the illusions prevalent in His day

with regard to the end of this world. On one point, at any rate, there will be a general agreement. Jesus' faith in the near approach of the Kingdom of God was quite central in His gospel, and therefore His vivid vision of the end affected directly or indirectly the whole of His ethical and religious teaching. It is therefore impossible to judge fairly both what Jesus said and what it is not recorded that He said unless we read His words in the closest connexion with His expectation of the speedy end of the present age.

There are hard sayings of Jesus, especially in the collection we call the Sermon on the Mount, which it is necessary to explain unnaturally or to ignore altogether if we suppose them to have been uttered with a long course of this world's history in view. But these sayings at once become intelligible and appropriate when we understand them to be the practical applications of that great principle of Jesus' gospel, 'the kingdom of God is at hand.' Some examples will serve to make my meaning clear.

The Gospels contain repeated demands of Jesus that relatives, lands, and riches should be renounced in order that nothing might hinder the urgent task of preparation for the coming Kingdom. All lower goods were to be sacrificed if their pursuit interfered with absolute trust in the triumphant power and love that were so soon to appear unchecked. It was thus quite natural that Jesus refused to arbitrate upon matters of social justice, that He forbade His followers to resist evil in defence of their rights, and that He had no constructive social policy. Riches were condemned by Jesus as a hindrance to the frame of mind He wished to produce in His followers; but there is not a word about a transference of money or land to any community for the good of each of its members. Since the Kingdom was expected in that generation, Jesus put forward no socialistic or any other economic scheme. All attempts, therefore, to find support in His sayings for the details of such schemes are bound to fail.

Again, it is unfair to blame Jesus because He did not teach the right use of our emotions and passions and the culture of the æsthetic and intellectual sides of human nature. Jesus never approved of violent ascetical practices for their own sake, as Sir Francis Younghusband seems to suppose; but on Jesus' view of the world there was no time for a gradual and cultured conquest of the

lower self. It was indeed a time of crisis in which Jesus called men even to lose their bodily life if only by that way they could attain the eternal life.

Sir Francis Younghusband sees a further mark of imperfection in the ethics of Jesus in the fact that He condemned forethought and provision for the future needs of the body. This criticism, however, is relevant and fair only if Jesus' precepts are judged as universally applicable rules. Since Jesus did not foresee the indefinite continuance of our present conditions of life, His precepts on such matters can be rightly judged only in their historical context.

Now if the teaching of Jesus was thus conditioned, what must we conclude its present authority and application to be? Must we say that it was merely an ethic for the interval before the end came, and therefore without any value for our modern world?¹ To this question, 'Has the teaching of Jesus a temporary or a permanent value?' it seems impossible to give a simple answer 'yes' or 'no.' It is essential to make a distinction here. All ethical teaching has a side that is conditioned by the particular time and place. Many moral maxims, for instance, depend on our having a material body. But it is also true that ethics contains under earthly forms eternal principles that are valid for all spiritual beings. In the teaching of Jesus, then, there is a local and ephemeral part and also a universal and eternal part. Jesus doubtless regarded some of His teachings as interim ethics: He looked forward to no buying and selling, riches and poverty, marriage and divorce in the Kingdom of God. But there is every reason to suppose that He regarded the great principles of love to God and man as the very foundation on which is based the everlasting reign of God in the hearts of His true sons. And we must make the same distinction when we judge our Lord's words. On the one hand, we may admit the limitations due to the forms of thought and manner of speech in His day. On the other hand, we may assert that He revealed spiritual and moral values that can never lose their worth because they are an aspect of the very life of God. Jesus promulgated no perfect code of moral laws, valid for all time. He had no perfect knowledge upon all possible pursuits of the human mind. But I have no doubt that we are

right in sharing His conviction that a life of trustful devotion to the Highest is a final revelation of God's will for our race. It is therefore only in a general and spiritual sense that we can uphold the authority of Jesus and defend the perfection of His teaching, and the truth of His revelation of Reality.

The fact seems to be that we are only just learning what it means to confess that Jesus was not only man, but a Galilean man of nearly 2000 years ago, and that He only revealed a religious knowledge of the will of God. This admission involves no loss since it relieves us of the difficulties that had been felt in the attempt to harmonize the scientific and historical opinions of Jesus with our modern knowledge. In order to illustrate the subjects upon which the beliefs implied in Jesus' teaching cannot foreclose our free inquiry we may notice the following:—

(1) Jesus' scientific opinions. Our Lord probably shared the ancient belief that what we know as diseases of the brain were caused by the possession of evil spirits.

(2) Historical opinions. With regard to the authorship and literal accuracy of the O.T. books, Jesus probably shared the current convictions that modern criticism has in some cases shown to be mistaken.

(3) Beliefs about the next world. Since, as we have seen, Jesus shared some of the less crude eschatological beliefs of His times, it is impossible to find in His teaching any information as to the exact nature of life after death. His words provide no basis for certainty with regard to the fact or the extent of future probation or purgation or of the ultimate salvation of all created souls. His parables, indeed, rather point to a final exclusion of the wicked from the heavenly Kingdom.

(4) Beliefs about the use of force by nations and individuals as a means to moral ends. The sayings of Jesus with reference to non-resistance are concerned with attacks upon property. And it was precisely in regard to property that the maxims of Jesus were most influenced by His belief in the imminent end of this age. In view of this coming catastrophe Christians might well be enjoined to set aside all earthly goods, give all their money to the poor, and even consent to the wicked seizure of their possessions as a safeguard against the sins of covetousness, hatred and revenge. We maintain, against the school of

¹ Jesus Himself, it appears, did not regard His teaching as a mere 'Interims-ethik.'

General von Bernhardi, that the principles to which these sins are opposed are binding still upon men and nations at all times, though the particular form of Christ's application of these principles was dependent on a view of the world that is now transcended. There are some Christians who believe in peace at any price, and there are others, like Rev. G. T. Sadler, who allow 'passive resistance' while they condemn 'active resistance.' But neither class can rightly claim the authority of the Sermon on the Mount, if our view of it is correct. We conclude, then, that pacifists have no reason from the Gospels to condemn all war, but the highest reasons for waging war, not for motives of hatred or revenge, but for the promotion of freedom, honour, justice, and truth among men.

(5) Metaphysical beliefs. Jesus revealed no new dogma about the ultimate Reality. He did not formulate the doctrine of the Trinity which was afterwards elaborated in order to express the meaning and value of the revelation in and through the person of Christ. Jesus' faith in the Fatherhood of God is still, to speak in the cold phrase of metaphysics, only a probable hypothesis. To many of us, indeed, it is the most probable theory of the nature of Reality. If, as is probable, Jesus shared

the Jews' belief in the devil, His belief is not binding upon us as the most exact possible explanation of the origin of evil. To the present writer a personal devil is an unnecessary and improbable hypothesis, in view of man's evolution from the lower and instinctively savage life of the brutes.

Is it not clear, then, that these critical investigations of modern thought involve no loss at all in the resulting conception of Jesus Christ? They are indeed a pure and positive gain, since they avert our gaze from what is doubtful so that we may fix our attention wholly upon those teachings of Christ that cannot be shaken. Jesus did not come to tell us all the secrets of natural science, of history, or even of metaphysics. His authority lies deeper than that of the scholar, and therefore we may be content not to know exactly what He said upon these subjects. Jesus came to reveal a life and a character that are eternal and divine. He came, therefore, not to fetter us with His theories of the world, but to give us a Holy Spirit, a hope and an end in our life. He only asked us to give the utmost for the Highest; to devote ourselves wholly to the pursuit of Truth, Goodness, Beauty, and Joy, which are our modern names for what Jesus called 'the Kingdom of God.'

In the Study.

The Gate.

THE Rev. Richard Roberts has published through the Student Christian Movement four addresses, three of which were delivered to students at the University of Liverpool. The title is *Christ and Ourselves*. The third lecture is on the Acceptance of Christ. In that lecture Mr. Roberts takes his text from the parable which we are accustomed to call the Parable of the Door (Jn 10⁹). He properly calls it the Parable of the Gate. For it is an open way in and out that is spoken of. He finds three ideas expressed in the parable.

1. *Security*.—'If any man enter in by me, he shall be saved.' Security is something we are all seeking. We are for ever putting or trying to put ourselves beyond the reach of the long arm of danger and mischance. But we know that with all our endeavour we stand in jeopardy every hour. Our life is a fragile and precarious affair at

the best, and none of the barricades with which we fence our lives about are impenetrable. Mere physical security we shall never attain. But there is a security which we may, and it is infinitely more precious; we may gain *moral* security. The counterpart of the figure of the Gate of the fold is the Shepherd of the sheep. And the Shepherd of the sheep says that they hear His voice and follow Him: 'And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, and no man shall be able to pluck them out of my hand.' And this is the guarantee He gives of our security—'The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep.' Will you suffer a witness of my own? I am a man of the commonest clay, of more than ordinary frailty, of more than ordinary amenability to temptation . . . and up to this day I am conscious of being a man who has been kept, and often (the more is the shame) kept in spite of himself. The

Lord is my Keeper. There is no doubt of that. Every one who has tried Him has found Him so. He shall be saved,—so runs the promise,—saved from dishonour, disgrace, shame, remorse, moral collapse, saved from very perdition. And it is true to-day as when Paul declared that neither life nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor any other creature, shall separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. 'He shall be saved,' that is, if he enter in. Accept Jesus Christ and you find a Saviour. To accept Him as Lord is to surrender to Him all that you are and have; to find Him a Saviour is to know that He will give you all that you require.

2. *Spaciousness*.—'He shall go in and out.' Another thing we want is freedom, spaciousness. We all want plenty of room. Perhaps our commonest complaint about life is that it is narrow, circumscribed, cramped. And in these days of specialization when most of us are set to do little bits of work and to do them over and over again, the narrowness of the routine cramps and paralyzes us utterly. I do not wonder when I hear that Smith or Brown has got tired of the city or the shop and has gone forth to seek space and emancipation in the broad plains of another continent. There is a restlessness in us which demands range, space, but of all futile things, to imagine that we can get more space by a change of environment is the most futile. The man who is cramped in the city will soon or late feel cramped on the prairie. The only spaciousness of life that is genuine and abiding is that which comes within us, when our minds become a continent and our souls a universe. And that comes with our surrender to Jesus Christ. He is not only Saviour, but emancipator and liberator. He will transfigure the dull narrow routine into a splendid highway; He will give us the franchise of a kingdom of boundless wealth; He will break the bands and fetters of routine and make the most stuffy vocation a palace of great possibilities. He himself becomes our universe in which henceforth we live and move and have our being.

3. *Sufficiency*.—'He shall find pasture.' Superfluity is not in the promise, but sufficiency is. Let him go in by the gate of fame, ambition, wealth, and he gains not sufficiency but scarcity, not food but a famine, not satisfaction but a growing hunger. Listen to this: 'I know from experience the intel-

lectual distractions of scientific research, philosophical speculation and artistic pleasures; but am also well aware that even when all are taken together and well sweetened to taste, in respect of consequent reputation, means, social position, etc., the whole concoction is but as high confectionery to a starving man.' This is the testimony of a man who was forced back at last upon the Gate which is Christ; and there he found sufficiency, enough to live upon. This is the unbroken witness of all who have entered in by this Gate; and it was a man who had gone in by this Gate who declared that he had learned whatever state he was in, therein to be content,—wanting nothing. The experience of St. Paul is confirmed by all the saints; and no man yet has found Jesus Christ come short of His word.

Security, spaciousness, sufficiency—here are our deepest needs. Jesus Christ stands or falls according to His ability to supply these needs as He promises. But this must be put to the test of personal experiment. One must try Him and give Him His opportunity, and that indeed is all that He asks. And one finds that the 'dead reckoning' of to-day becomes the midday sun of every subsequent morrow.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

September Gleaners.

'Let me glean and gather after the reapers among the sheaves.'—Ruth 2⁷.

There was a wonderful French painter called Millet. When he was a boy he was quite poor, his father being just what we in this country call a crofter. When little Jean Millet sat down to dinner, it would be at a very bare, homely table. But though no one seemed to notice it, Jean had eyes that saw everything, and he had a heart that loved those round about him. He had seen old women gleaning in the harvest fields, and he noticed that they looked tired and weary—so different from those who were young. Furthermore he could not but observe that many field workers were very good. When the Angelus, or call for evening prayer, rang out across the fields, Jean had seen the men take off their caps, and close their eyes as if they prayed, while the women bowed their heads and looked solemn. In course of time, Jean

became an artist, and painted a picture called 'The Angelus.' It is very beautiful. You must remember to look for a print of it: there are many of them all over the country. He also painted one called 'The Gleaners.' The latter is a picture with a great deal of thought in it. Many English and Scottish people who visit country districts in France, and see the men and women working in the harvest fields, think of those two pictures of Millet's, 'The Angelus' and 'The Gleaners.' Through them, they have learnt to love the French peasantry.

But there are pictures that are not painted on canvas. Haven't you yourselves got pictures in your own minds? You have, I feel sure, one of 'Joseph' in his coat of many colours, of 'Rebecca at the Well,' of 'Moses,' when he had reached the safe shore of the Red Sea. In the Book of Ruth there is a beautiful picture of a gleaner. It is finer than Millet's one. Millet's work will become old-fashioned; people will one day speak of him as belonging to a past age. But the Bible picture of 'Ruth the Gleaner' is loved more and more as time goes on. Millet's gleaners make us think of life being toilsome, of women having to work when they are old and tired; the gleaners of the Book of Ruth live in the sunshine, they are all young.

Gleaners had a real place in the Jewish harvest field. In our country, they would be spoken to sharply, and sent home. But there was an old Hebrew law about gleaning. Listen to it, for it is very beautiful.

'When ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not make clean riddance of the corners of thy field when thou reapest, neither shalt thou gather any gleaning of thy harvest: thou shalt leave them unto the poor, and to the stranger: I am the Lord. . . . When thou cuttest down thine harvest in thy field, and hast forgot a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow: that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hands.'

Ruth, although I can believe she was very gentle, and very beautiful, took her place amongst those poor people. In the course of her short life sad things had happened to her, but she was very brave. She and her mother-in-law had had a long talk together about their sorrows, and the elderly woman discovered that Ruth cared more for love than for the mere enjoyment of life. 'Let me now

go to the field, and glean ears of corn after him in whose sight I shall find grace,' she pleaded with Naomi. And Boaz, the owner of the field to which she went, was very good indeed to her. It is a very fascinating story. The poet Keats represents Ruth as weeping when she hears the nightingale singing while she gleanes. If she did weep, her tears, I feel sure, would be tears of thankfulness and joy. Grown-up people do sometimes shed tears when they are very glad and thankful.

Here are a few lines of Keats' exquisite poem on the Nightingale:

Thou wast not born for death, immortal Bird!

The voice I hear this passing night was heard
in ancient days by emperor and clown;
Perhaps the self-same song that found a path
through the sad heart of Ruth, when, sick for
home,
She stood in tears amid the alien corn.

'Ruth, the Gleaner' is an old-time picture. But during these September days, I hope many of you may have an opportunity of being in some harvest field. There is no fun like the fun of playing amongst the stooks. Long ago, how we used to love to hear the swish of the scythe, and watch the women gathering the corn, and binding the sheaves. You will not, I fear, see a real gleaner like Ruth. The gleaner in the field you visit will probably be just a boy with a big rake.

I want to turn your attention to that boy. He is sometimes very interesting. Underneath his silence there may be much that is worth copying. If a big person asked an Aberdeenshire 'rake' how he liked his work, the answer would probably be as curt as 'I like it fine.' But the memory of not a few Aberdeenshire farm boys has come to be a sacred memory. I knew one who became a great scholar. While he raked, silently—for he rarely spoke—his mind was on his 'version,' and when he dreamed dreams—which he sometimes did—they were of one day going to the university.

'That is all very fine and fanciful,' some one here may be saying, 'but I live in a city tenement, I never see the harvest fields.' Let me tell you of a boy gleaner, whose home was in a top-flat. His name was Jim. He attended Sunday School, and one day the teacher put a question, the answer to which involved the mention of an obscure classical character. To her surprise Jim answered correctly.

'How did you come to know that?' she asked. 'Please,' he said, 'they were taking in coals to the Academy; I followed the carts, and gathered up all the loose leaves in the yards and read them at home.' Jim was a gleaner, and a good one.

And there was a little Italian fellow, called Michael. His father was a stone-cutter. Michael was strong in mind and body. The first sounds he knew were the ring of the hammer, and the working of the chisel in the quarries. He was not a clever scholar. He just kept scribbling over everything with drawings. His father was disappointed and whipped the boy for spoiling the white-washed walls of the house. But whippings did no good. Michael went back to his drawings: he thought it was worth while suffering pain, so long as he could get on. But he had made a great friend—a boy about his own age, who was learning to be an artist, whose father had plenty of money. His name was Francesco. Every morning Francesco brought to Michael designs borrowed from his master's studio, and these Michael copied. He made wonderful progress, and in course of time became the great Michael Angelo. But I feel sure that he looked back to those days when he 'gleaned' as being very happy days indeed. What did whippings matter?

In Lanarkshire there was born into a humble home a boy who was named David. His father's name was Neil Livingstone. When David was quite little he used to help his mother in the house. He did not quite like this work, and made it a condition that the house door should be kept shut so that the people passing might not see him working. At ten years of age he was sent to work in a factory. With his first half-crown, he bought an old Latin Grammar. He propped it up on the back of his spinning frame, and as he went backwards and forwards, he learnt little bits by heart. That was 'gleaning.' I daresay you have guessed that he became the great missionary, David Livingstone.

Now, boys and girls, this world is a wonderful harvest field. The little flowers! Can't we glean their sweetness? Can't we learn their names? There are men and women, as well as boys and girls, who glean constantly, and in ever so many different fields. They get to know a great deal, yet they themselves feel that they are but beginning to learn. Gleaning is work that makes one feel very happy. I can imagine how Ruth and

Naomi would, at the end of the first day's work, thank God for His goodness. When you go back to school, you go to glean in a harvest field. Great reapers have been in front of you, and have left many sheaves. You surely will not throw away your splendid opportunities. And, lying before you are the sheaves left by those who wanted most of all to know about God and His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. I knew a very clever student. He loved the Bible above everything. Morning, noon, and night he studied it. He gleaned with all his might. In his enthusiasm he worked so hard that to the sorrow of all his friends he fainted by the way; but now that he is gone from this world, men are gleaning the sheaves that he left behind. Thus the gleaning goes on. Boys and girls, will you, along with your school work, try every day to glean a little knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ? If you do, you will grow to be the sort of men and women that make the world better.

II.

Children of the North Wind.

'A stormy wind came out of the north.'—Ezek 1⁴.

I have been thinking lately that different people are rather like different winds. Some are North-wind people, some South-wind, some East-wind, and some West-wind. So I am going to speak to you about each of these winds in turn, and the people who are like them, and I hope you will be able to recognize yourself amongst them. Of course there are winds between these that have a bit of both North and East, and these we call North-East winds; and winds which have a bit of both South and East, and these we call South-East winds; and so on. And there are people too who have a bit of two winds in their nature, so if you cannot find yourself amongst the North-wind people, or the South-wind people, or the East-wind people, or the West-wind people, perhaps you will find yourself if you take a bit out of two of those winds and put them together.

Well we shall have a talk to-day about the North-wind people. I think you will find most of them among the boys, though you may find a few among the girls too.

Mr. North Wind is rather a blustering old fellow. He bursts open our doors, and howls down our chimneys. He brings blizzards which chill us to the bone and hard frosts which burst our water-

pipes and crack our jugs if we are not careful. When he blows in real earnest he allows nothing to stand in his way. He snaps the bare branches off the trees, he tears the slates off our roofs, and dashes the hail against our windows. In fact, he makes a great amount of noise, and does a good deal of destruction.

So much for Mr. North Wind himself; but now what about the North-wind people? Well, they are the sort of people you hear all over the house. You always know when they are in, because they immediately signal their entrance by slamming the front door. Then they dash upstairs three steps at a time, and slam another door at the top. Their boots seemed to have more nails in them than any other people's; at any rate, they have the gift of clattering to a marvellous extent.

These people are destructive. They seem to have little regard for mother's good carpets or any of her treasured possessions. It is not that they really want to destroy them, but they just don't think. Their manners are a little rough, and they have rather a bad habit of speaking before they think, so that sometimes they damage other people's feelings as they damage the carpets—just for want of thought. Their tempers are somewhat breezy, but usually it is the case with them of a good storm and then all is over. The worst of it is that they sometimes do a good deal of destruction with these storms, and the effects are felt by others after they are forgotten by themselves.

But we are not going to say that Mr. North Wind has nothing but defects. Oh dear, no! He is really a decent sort of chap, and, to tell the truth, we are rather fond of him. First of all, he is very bracing to strong people. He blows away a lot of microbes, and makes our blood tingle with health. And then, if he does frighten the plants so that they hide underground, he at least gives compensation, for he brings a thick blanket of snow to cover them up and keep them cosy, so that they shoot up again stronger than ever in the Spring.

And then he is an out-and-out fellow. There is no deceit about him. He doesn't pretend to be anything else but what he is. As he comes rushing along he shouts, 'Here I am now! Look out for squalls! Build up your fires, and put on your overcoats, and your thickest boots, for when I begin to blow in good earnest, you know what that means!'

And he is a jolly fellow. He provides us with a

lot of fun in the way of skating, and sledging, and snowballing; in fact, we should miss him dreadfully if he deserted us altogether.

And we really could not get on without our North-wind people. They do a lot to cheer us up. They are a little rough in their way of doing it, but they are so jolly and good-hearted that we are ready to make allowances for that. They are very straight and above-board, and are so anxious not to appear better than they are, that they usually succeed in making people think they are a great deal worse than they are. You would be surprised to find how tender they sometimes are to little weak things, just as Mr. North Wind is tender to the little weak plants, and covers them up with snow. It is only by chance you discover this, because they are awfully ashamed to let other people know they have a soft spot in their hearts.

I want to say just one word in closing to the North-wind people. Don't be proud of your roughness. It is nothing to be proud of. In fact, if you persist in it, it will spoil and disfigure you in the end. The North Wind cannot help its roughness and harshness, because it is made that way, and it comes to us over fields of ice and snow in the Polar regions. But you can help your roughness. It is something you wear on the outside; it is a habit which can be got rid of. But remember you will have to fight it, and you will have to *want* to fight it. Boys and girls of the North Wind, let your good hearts tell. Don't keep them hidden away inside that hard exterior. Give yourselves over to the keeping of Jesus, and He will help you to get rid of all your defects: He will make the hard places in your nature soft, and the rough places smooth.

III.

The Rev. Thomas McConnell, B.A., has published some addresses which he gave to his young people on 'Belgium, the Great War, and our Lads in Blue.' After the title of the first address he calls his book *White Wings* (Allenson; 1s. net). One of the addresses is on

Fog.

You will recollect that in our first address, one night when the sea was calm and everything peaceful and still, the captain of the little steamer, whose duty it was to sail between Harwich and

Antwerp, pointed out that it was not always like that. There were times when it was rough enough.

That led me to reflect on the dangers of the deep.

'What are you most afraid of at sea, captain?'

'Oh, I fancy a good thick fog is just as dangerous a customer to deal with as anything that comes our way.'

And so I shall speak of fog, the sailor's foe; an enemy that daring is no protection against, but which demands the greatest caution. A man may have no fear as he dashes into the thick wall of mist by which he is enveloped, yet I will not call that courage. Rather is it foolhardiness, that so recklessly risks collision. For the only way to fight fog is by caution, and again caution every time.

How great has been the toll of ships around our British coasts, practically every year, on account of fog! When we get our cross-channel mails regularly every morning, little do we think of the brave men whose business it is nightly to risk their lives, in order to bring them to us.

It is when some great disaster like the loss of the *Empress of Ireland* takes place, owing to collision in fog, that it is brought home to us how great are the risks that brave men are continually taking, and that without a word, upon the sea. Oh, I think that in these islands of ours, where we do not boast when we say that our home is upon the deep, we should never forget in church or at the family altar to pray for our heroes who go down to the sea in ships!

And specially at this time, when our fathers and brothers and husbands and sons their nightly vigil keep, watching with patience lest the enemy steal upon their dear ones in the silence of the night; in these days of peril and need, when we have the flag of Nelson and his gallant sea-dogs still to keep flying, should we unceasingly call upon the name of the Lord for help and keeping.

None know better than our boys in blue how hard a task it is to watch an enemy's fleet, on the alert to dash through under cover of a heavy fog, and inflict damage on a defenceless town. But they know that in England are wives and mothers and sleeping children who are trusting them, and they are determined to do their duty. God bless them!

Eternal Father, strong to save,
Whose arm hath bound the restless wave,
Who bidd'st the mighty ocean deep
Its own appointed limits keep,
O hear us when we cry to Thee
For those in peril on the sea.

O Trinity of love and power,
Our brethren shield in danger's hour;
From rock and tempest, fire and foe,
Protect them wheresoe'er they go:
Thus evermore shall rise to Thee
Glad hymns of praise from land and sea.

How helpless even a skilful mariner feels in a fog! I remember being practically held up in a heavy fog on the Bank of Newfoundland, a place where fogs are almost continuous, for three days and nights. We could not see the bow of the ship, although we were in a position almost amidships. Like a thick, clammy blanket the fog clung around us, creating a dismal, miserable feeling among us all. At about four knots an hour we crawled along, and sometimes in the night we knew the ship had stopped, and once even she reversed engines.

What gave us greatest confidence was the knowledge that we had an exceptionally skilful and experienced commander in charge, the commodore, in fact, of the fleet of steamers by one of which we were travelling. It was good to know that while we were helpless ourselves, yet we had for captain one whom we could trust, one who knew his business thoroughly, and who would take no undue risks. We were late in getting in, but we arrived.

Young people, friends of mine, before you reach the home port you will doubtless encounter fog—it may be seen. There is the fog of doubt. How many temptations there are at school and college, in the office and in business, among the young bloods of our modern life, to doubt almost everything one has learned about the Bible, about the Christian religion, about God!

More dangerous is it still when young people begin to question whether, after all, it pays to be good, to keep the Sabbath day, to pray, to take one's stand on the side of honesty, of truth, and of purity.

'Indulge this once just to see what it is like.' It is the Devil's voice I hear, whispering in your ear. And when one begins to wonder whether it

is not the best course to thrust one's hand into the fire to see whether it will burn, the fog is getting very thick indeed, and a soul is already in deadliest peril.

The only right course for a ship venturing out upon the sea of life, where fogs are rife, is to get the right Captain on the bridge from the start. Have Him there before the fog begins, before doubt has suggested itself to your mind, before the glamour of sin has blinded you to the beauty of holiness. Get Jesus upon the bridge, and He will keep you safe and sound amid all the perils that shall follow.

Around the fire on a winter evening a fellow-student of my own told me that for a considerable time he had been an agnostic. I knew him for a keen, enthusiastic Christian worker, and I asked him—

'What was it led you to faith?'

'Well,' he said, 'there was one thing I could never get away from, and that was my mother's piety. I could easily have riddled all her arguments, but I could not riddle her sweet Christian character, and I knew it was her religion which was the mainspring of that.'

'Did you become clear about things all at once?'

'Oh, no, it all came gradually. When I was a boy of twelve I had given my heart to the Saviour, and in those days He was very real to me. It seems to me that He then mounted the bridge of my life, and that He never took His hand off the helm.'

'Was He with you in your doubting days?'

'I am sure of it. They were only a phase such as every young man whose mind is waking up passes through. But Jesus held His place in my life, silently and surely, though I did not know it. And then when I contrasted my mother's pure, angelic life and character with the nothings I had been exalting in its place, I saw that only Christ, who was responsible for that character, could satisfy my mind, as I had come to think He alone could satisfy my heart.'

Get Christ on the bridge, boys and girls. The fog of doubt and questioning may come. The more intelligent and thoughtful you are the more likely it is to come, at least the fog that makes you not sure of the things you have been taught. The other fog comes to every young person, who ventures out upon the world, some time. But if you allow Jesus to take His place early in your life, no fog that ever gathered will prevent Him from safely conducting you to the heavenly shore.

The Pioneer of Faith and of Salvation.

A STUDY OF THE PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF JESUS AS PRESENTED IN
THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

BY THE REV. ALFRED E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

III.

1. THIS personal experience being what is significant and valuable in the Incarnation, we may look at its general character before we turn to consider the light which is thereby thrown on particular incidents of the life of Jesus. The purpose of this experience is that the *Pioneer of faith and salvation* might be *perfected through sufferings*; regarding this statement we must ask two questions—(i.) Wherein consisted this perfection? and (ii.) what were the sufferings by which it was obtained? His perfection is described in general

terms in 7²⁶. He is 'holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens.' 'Christ,' says Westcott *in loco*, 'is personally in Himself *holy*, in relation to men *guileless*, in spite of contact with a sinful world *undefiled*. By the issue of His life He has been *separated from sinners* in regard to the visible order, and in regard to the invisible world, *He has risen above the heavens*.' This perfection is not untried innocence, for He 'hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' (4¹⁵). Sin was neither the source nor the result of His temptation. He was not tempted as we are, when we are

assailed by solicitations of evil due to previous indulgence in sin, or when we succumb to the assaults of evil; nor need we assume that every kind of temptation to which man is exposed was experienced by Him; but only that temptation was as thoroughly real to Him as it is to us. Not quantitative equivalence, but qualitative resemblance alone needs to be asserted.

2. There are two characteristics of the perfection of Jesus which this Epistle emphasizes—sympathy with man, and obedience to God. He was 'made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted' (2¹⁷⁻¹⁸). 'We have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' (4¹⁵). Because He has had the human experience He not only feels with us in His mercy, but so understands and responds to our need that He ever uses to the uttermost in His faithfulness all the functions by which our need is met. The functions are threefold: 'propitiation for the sins of the people' (2¹⁷), 'succour' of 'them that are tempted' (v.¹⁸), and *intercession* (4¹⁶); and it is evident that for each of these functions sympathy is a qualification. Without describing this propitiation as either vicarious penitence or vicarious penalty, as both terms are not strictly applicable to the sinless, yet His sacrifice must be regarded as such a self-identification of Himself in love with mankind as enabled Him to experience sin's consequences. He so put Himself in the place of mankind that He felt the sin, shame, and sorrow due to sin as His very own. He could even think of and feel regarding death what sinful men think and feel. But while His propitiation cancels the sinful past, His succour and intercession (the earthly and the heavenly counterpart of the same tender and mighty solicitude on man's behalf) guarantee deliverance from, and victory over, present evil: and to both sympathy is essential. But to remove a common misunderstanding, it may be added here that to feel fully and truly with the tempted it is not necessary to have fallen before temptation, but only to have endured it. He who resists until victorious, experiences the full force of the temptation as he who yields does not. Sin deadens, while

holiness quickens, sympathy even with the sinful. So important is the consideration that it may be repeated: it is the sympathy of Jesus that is the best approach to an apprehension and appreciation of His Saviourhood.

3. Corresponding to Jesus' sympathy with man is His obedience towards God, and both are expressions and exercises of love appropriate to the respective relations. As the brother of sinful, sorrowing, and dying men, He shows His love as sympathy; as the Son of the perfect God, as obedience. 'Who in the days of his flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and having been heard for his godly fear, though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things that he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation' (5⁷⁻⁹). We must return to discuss v.⁷ as a description of the agony in Gethsemane especially: but meanwhile attention must be concentrated on v.⁸, while in passing it may be pointed out how v.⁹ confirms the analogy we are insisting on between the experience of Jesus and of man. His obedience to God in His sacrifice has its counterpart in their obedience to Him for their salvation. (i.) 'He learned obedience by the things that he suffered' (ἐμαθεν ἂφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν). This statement does not mean merely that Jesus through the sufferings of His life learned to obey, acquired the habit of obedience, but that His sufferings were of such a kind as to make the maximum demand conceivable or possible for the surrender of the will to God; by His surrender He measured the distance between the deepest depths of desolation and the highest heights of blessedness. His sacrifice was a perfect act of obedience without reserves or limits. Was this obedience an exception to, a contradiction of His Sonship towards God, or was it its full and last expression? The clause *καί τις ὡς υἱός* suggests the former interpretation, and Westcott *in loco* adopts it: 'Although Son and therefore endowed with right of access for Himself to the Father, being of an essence with the Father, for man's sake as man He won the right of access for humanity. In one sense it is true that the idea of Sonship suggests that of obedience; but the nature of Christ's Sonship at first sight seems to exclude the thought that He should learn obedience

through suffering.' Conceding that the writer of the Epistle intended a contrast between the two clauses, as for him the Sonship of Christ expressed the divine dignity, yet this exposition contains several errors on which it is worth dwelling. The introduction of such a phrase as 'being of an essence with the Father' fixes on the Scriptures the theology of the later creeds. The contrast between what Christ did 'as man, and for man's sake,' and what as Son of God He was in Himself and did for Himself, reproduces the dualism of the creed of Chalcedon between the human and the divine nature, and also the dualism which has introduced so much unreality into the representation of Christ's work between His person and His office. In opposition to this method of interpretation, we must insist that if the Incarnation is a revelation and not a concealment of God, then to the Sonship as temporally realized in obedience there does correspond the Sonship which is eternal reality. Not 'in one sense' only, but in every sense, 'it is true that the idea of Sonship suggests that of obedience,' and if 'the nature of Christ's Sonship at first sight seems to exclude the thought that He should learn obedience through suffering,' the sooner we get beyond the first sight to a deeper view the better for our theology. We shall never get an adequate Christology till we rid ourselves of the assumption that in the moral and religious sphere there is contradiction and not affinity between God and man, and that consequently there was a contrast between what Christ was as Son of God, and what He did or suffered as man for man's sake. In the *essential* trinity there must be the possibility of all that *becomes* the actuality in the *economic* trinity. We must insist on a more vital unity of God and man in Christ than the two-nature doctrine allows: but to do this we must get rid of the assumption of an impassible God, and must boldly affirm, in spite of the anathemas of 'the holy, great, Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon,' 'the monstrous doctrine that the divine nature of the only-begotten is passible.' But turning from Westcott's comment to the text itself, the contrast of the two clauses seems to be inconsistent with the general standpoint of the Epistle, which presents not a contradiction but a revelation of the eternal reality in the temporal experience of Jesus and believers. Insistence on the contrast of sonship and obedience would involve that the former is noumenon and the latter only pheno-

menon, to use Kantian terms, or the former idea and the latter only image, to use Platonic.

(ii.) The motive of His obedience is 'godly fear' (εὐλάβεια). Westcott *in loco* can here be quoted without any criticism. 'Εὐλάβεια marks that careful and watchful reverence which pays regard to every circumstance in that with which it has to deal. It may, therefore, degenerate into a timid and unworthy anxiety (Jos. *Antt.* vi. 2. 179); but more commonly it expresses reverent and thoughtful shrinking from over-boldness, which is compatible with true courage (Philo, *Quis. rer. div. haer.*, § 6 (i. 476 M)). . . . Christ by His εὐλάβεια perfectly realized that submission which is obedience on one side and fellowship on the other.' Mind, heart, and will were in perfect accord, in entire self-surrender to the will of God.

(iii.) It is this obedience to God that gives its value to the sacrifice in contrast to all animal sacrifices. The author of the Epistle puts into the lips of Christ the words of the psalmist (40⁶⁻⁸, LXX) in depreciation of animal sacrifices and exaltation of general obedience. 'Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body didst thou prepare for me: in whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hadst no pleasure: then said I, Lo, I am come. . . . To do thy will, O God' (10⁵⁻⁷). He repeats the declaration, 'Lo, I am come to do thy will' as the abrogation of the old and the establishment of the new order (v.⁹): and then argues that it is this obedience of Christ which makes the death of Christ an efficacious offering for the sanctification of believers (v.¹⁰). Such value is given to the sacrifice that it needs no repetition (v.¹⁴). Well would it have been for Christian theology if, dealing with the doctrine of the Atonement, it had always kept in view this declaration. It is no quantitative equivalence of Christ's sufferings and the eternal pains of the sinful race that measures the value of the sacrifice; it is the qualitative transcendence by the obedience of Christ of the whole moral history of the race that makes the Cross so final and perfect an expression of the whole relation of God to man and his sin, the divine propitiation, both judgment and forgiveness. For the present purpose we need not go further in this exposition.

4. The sufferings by which the sympathy of Jesus was developed and He learned obedience may be very briefly mentioned. What is made prominent *first of all* is His liability to temptation, which must include the whole range of His contact and conflict

with the evil of the world. *Secondly*, His strivings with God in prayer regarding His death are referred to (5⁷). While we must not limit the reference to Gethsemane, yet there this element in the passion is most clearly and fully presented to us; and we shall in the next section see what light this saying throws on that event. *Lastly*, the death itself is presented as the completion of the sacrifice, and that death is referred to not as an event merely, but as an experience. 'We behold him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God he should taste death for every man' (2⁹). Reserving the first part of the sentence for subsequent treatment, the last clause claims closer consideration, *ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσῃται θανάτου*. Attention may *first of all* be called to the variant reading *χωρὶς θεοῦ*, which might mean one of four things, that Christ's divinity was not involved in His death, or that He died with the sense of desolation (cf. Mt 27⁴⁶), or that God was not included among these, on account or for the benefit of whom Christ died. But we need not settle the question, as *χάριτι θεοῦ* is much the more probable reading. The grace of God was not the result of, but the reason for, the vicarious death of Christ. Because God is grace, God willed that Christ should die for all. *Secondly*, 'taste death' is not merely a periphrasis for 'die,' just as 'learned obedience' is not for 'obeyed.' Christ, because sinless and in fellowship with God, realized the full import of death as the penalty of sin, inclusive of the sense of separation from God, which is the sting given to death by sin. His sympathy with man made Him realize all that death means for man, His obedience to God recognized fully the will of God in death as such final adequate judgment of God in sin. His experience was qualitatively perfect. *Thirdly*, the clause *ὑπὲρ παντὸς* suggests also that it was quantitatively complete. He realized death in its universality, as embracing the whole race.

IV.

1. The Epistle throws light not only on the experience of Jesus generally, but on particular incidents in His life, to which we may now turn. We need not add anything to what it has been already needful to say about the temptation and the death of Jesus; but there remain three inci-

dents to which fuller reference may now be made. The writer cannot be satisfied with the exegesis of 2⁹ usually given. The construction is intolerably loose if the phrase 'crowned with glory and honour' refers to the Resurrection and Ascension subsequent to 'the suffering of death,' and the tasting death for every man. The crowning with glory and honour is a preparation for, and not a result of the sacrifice. While it is possible that the author of the Epistle might regard the vocation to sacrifice as itself glory and honour, even as in the Fourth Gospel (12²⁸, 13³¹, 17¹); yet a more definite allusion is more probable. He writes with a definite knowledge of the earthly life of Jesus; and so we may assume that the story of the Transfiguration was familiar to him. That event was the completion of Jesus' human development: He was 'ripe for glory,' ready and fit for the glorious and blessed immortality, the destiny to which mankind had failed to attain. He had this foretaste of heaven, however, only to confirm Him in and equip Him for the purpose to surrender the glory and honour He might have claimed as His right, to put Himself in man's place, and to share with man the doom of death, which in no way was His due. Even if the author had not this event in view, it appropriately illustrates his otherwise difficult statement.

2. While it is probable that Jesus on more than one occasion 'wrestled with God in prayer,' yet Gethsemane seems to offer the most telling illustration of 5⁷. There He 'offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears.' There He prayed that God might save Him, 'not from death, but out of death' (*ἐκ θανάτου*). 'The phrase,' says Westcott *in loco*, 'covers two distinct ideas, "to save from physical death so that it should be escaped," "to bring safe out of death into a new life." In the first sense the prayer recorded in Jn 12²⁷ was not granted, that it might be granted in the second.'

One wonders why the allusion is not made to the record of Gethsemane in Mt 26³⁶⁻⁴⁶, as that suggests another possibility. It is not likely that Jesus was in any way doubtful of the necessity of His death, and desired to escape it. If He anticipated in Gethsemane what He experienced in Calvary, it was the dereliction (27⁴⁶) He shrank from, and prayed to be spared. It was surely *εἰλάβεια* that the Son should dread this separation from the Father: and yet the obedience to the

Father could be perfected only by His assent to even this experience, the maximum of suffering possible to Him. The prayer was granted, not in the Resurrection, although that followed in necessary sequence, but in His recovery even on the Cross, of His communion with, and confidence in His Father, as the words of self-committal show (Lk 23⁴⁶). It was surely thus that He was 'saved out of death.'

3. The last incident referred to in this Epistle has not yet come under our consideration; but it is interesting to note that the ascriptions of Sonship and even of absolute divinity to Christ in 1⁵⁻¹⁴ in contrasting Him with the angels are related not to the eternal existence, or the temporal incarnation of the Son, but as vv.^{3,4} show, to the Ascension. 'When he had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; having become by so much better than the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent

name than they.' There can be no doubt that the author of the Epistle does assign pre-existent Sonship and divinity to Christ; in the quotations in vv.¹⁰⁻¹² he applies to Christ words used of God Himself. But as little doubt is there, those in agreement with Paul in Ro 1⁴ and Ph 2⁹⁻¹¹, he regarded the Ascension as not merely a return to previous glory (as in Jn 17⁵), but as an increase of the glory and the honour, an enhancement of the dignity and authority of the Son of God. In his view the earthly life, work, and suffering of Christ has an eternal significance and value for the very being of God Himself; its result is taken up into the relation of the Father and the Son; it is no temporary episode unrelated to, and not affecting, the inner life of God Himself, but it is a moment and a movement of the very being of the Supreme Himself. Thus in Christ idea and image, noumenal and phenomenal, invisible and visible, eternal and temporal, God and man are one reality.

Literature.

THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.

THE volume on the *History of Christian Missions* for the 'International Theological Library' has been entrusted to the Rev. Charles Henry Robinson, D.D., Hon. Canon of Ripon Cathedral and Editorial Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (T. & T. Clark; ros. 6d.).

It is an immense subject for a single volume, for Dr. Robinson begins with St. Paul and ends with Dr. Mott, and he takes all the churches, all the societies, all the men and women (without naming them all) with him as he goes. There is no confusion. The work has been mapped out as if it were an Encyclopædia article. And so far as we have been able to test the book, there is no respect of persons or of agencies. Every man, woman, and movement that has accomplished anything for the progress of the Kingdom gets an equal share of attention and a place in this great roll of honour.

The statistics are up to date. They are very many, but no weariness has deprived them of their

necessary verification. There are lies, blank lies, and statistics, said the pessimist. The statistics in this book are too startling to be untrue; they are too startling both in their bigness and in their littleness. What accounts for it? Why here progress and prosperity like the rushing mighty wind, there stagnation and derision? God only knows. But sure it is that the missionaries are of the very salt of the earth. Even in these business-like statistical pages one can see that, and it is all the same whether they are preaching or teaching or healing; they all see of the travail of their soul, whether they are satisfied or not. There is no book that says more for the race than this book.

Canon Robinson has opened his book with a chapter on Methods. That was a good thought. Where does he find the best methods and the best account of them? In the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. How often do you return to that book—the Book of the Acts of the Apostles? It is the barometer of the New Testament. If you read it much and pray much over what you read, it will make a missionary of you, and when the next Survey of Missions is written your name will be written there.

THE CROWD.

'One day at a watering-place the rumour went about that the "sea-serpent" was lying outside, some few yards from the beach. Everybody rushed to the shore, and all saw clearly the monster's head, as it stuck out of the water from time to time. Even sceptics felt themselves being convinced little by little of the existence of the mythical monster. Some photographed the beast; others talked about rowing out in a fishing-boat to get a nearer look at it. A cod-fisher came on the scene, and explained that the sea-serpent was nothing but a brown stone, which now was covered by the waves, now came to light again. For years the visitors had watched the stone, without its having occurred to anyone that it resembled a sea-monster; but so soon as someone asserted that it was a living beast everybody else saw it in the same light, until the illusion produced by the suggestion disappeared before the cod-fisher's explanation as abruptly as it had arisen.'

This story is told by Arthur Christensen in a work which has been translated into English and published under the title of *Politics and Crowd-Morality* (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d. net). This Crowd-morality is very much the same as that which Professor Gilbert Murray speaks of as Herd-instinct. It is a new study, or nearly new, and there is something in it. According to its students, there is much in it, and much more has already come out of it than we have taken notice of. Let us say, for example, that this horrible war has come out of it. Let us say that all wars in all the ages of the world have come out of it. Surely it is time we had studied it a little that we may watch its ways in the future and curb its evil inclinations.

The great danger lies in the fact that the crowd is subject to suggestion, and that when a suggestion catches on, anything may follow, a harmlessly silly thing or a most harmful and disastrous thing. 'A single example will be enough to show the power of social suggestion. The refined social world of the eighteenth century had cultivated the art of dying with the same mild, harmonious calm as it had shown in life. The women in particular understood how to die stylishly. They left the world with tact and dignity, without a sign of fear or pain which might grate upon the survivors.

'It was the century in which the death-struggle had passed the stage of nonchalance and reached that of epigram, the century in which a dying princess summoned her physicians, her confessor, and her steward to her bedside, and said to the physicians: "Gentlemen, you have killed me, but in doing so, you have been true to your rules and principles"; to the confessor: "You have done your duty, by frightening me out of my wits"; and to her steward: "You are here by the wish of my people, who desire that I should make my will; you all play your parts very well, but you must admit that I am not playing mine badly." The woman's soul went apparelled in wit to meet Death, while the Princess of Talmont's body was carried in a blue and silver robe to the grave.'

All this would be only absurd, if crowds were only mobs or mere cliques and coteries. But States are crowds, 'enormous and very heterogeneous crowds,' and when a State catches an infection—the infection of some suggestion of hatred or envy of another State—the evil may be incalculable, the misery untold. It is wise then to study the crowd. It may be studied with sufficient interest and alarm in this book.

NATURAL THEOLOGY.

When a lectureship in Comparative Religion was founded at Oxford, the first lecturer appointed was Mr. Clement C. J. Webb, Fellow of Magdalen. Mr. Webb has now published the first three courses of lectures delivered by him during the academical years 1911-12 and 1912-13. The book is called *Studies in the History of Natural Theology* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; 10s. 6d. net).

In the first lecture Mr. Webb seeks to discover the meaning of Natural Theology. That is not easy. It is easy enough to say what Natural Theology is when we know what is Natural Religion. In Mr. Webb's own words, Natural theology 'must denote the reasoned and articulated account of what is implied in the existence of natural religion.' But what is natural religion?

To answer that question takes practically the whole of the first course of lectures. Mr. Webb proceeds in two ways. First he asks what is meant by 'Nature' in philosophical discussion, and finding that it means a great many different things he tries the other way. The other way is to see what natural religion is contrasted with. In the oldest

discussions it was contrasted with civil or political religion, in the later with revealed religion. But these two mean much the same thing. So it is natural as contrasted with revealed religion that forms the subject of the three courses of lectures contained in this book.

The second course describes and criticizes the 'Natural Theology of Plato.' With the third we pass to the Middle Ages, and consider Anselm, Abelard, St. Thomas Aquinas, Raymond of Sebonde, Pietro Pomponazzi, and Lord Herbert of Cherbury as natural theologians.

The work is both independent and unbiassed. Its scholarship is above reproach. The interest grows as the lectures proceed. Without doubt Mr. Webb has made a most valuable contribution to the history of the Philosophy of Religion.

CITIZENS TO BE.

Citizens to be is the title of a social study of Health, Wisdom, and Goodness, with special reference to Elementary Schools, which has been made by Miss M. L. V. Hughes, late Exhibitioner of Somerville College, Oxford (Constable; 4s. 6d. net).

Principal Viriamu Jones used to contend that two things were necessary, not one only—character and knowledge. Miss Hughes agrees. For her, knowledge is necessary as a matter of course. But character also, even in elementary schools. She might be content to see knowledge swallowed up in goodness, but she will never pursue knowledge for its own sake. To her as to all great teachers, 'art for art's sake' is of the Evil One.

She says: 'The more we can identify wisdom and goodness, the knowledge of what is with the love of what is right, the more are we in touch with our Masters. It is only the false narrowing of the intellectual aim to mere information that could warrant any hard-and-fast demarcation of it from the moral. Judgments of value are judgments of fact, and, for the Humanist, these facts are of the highest order, taking precedence of scientific facts just so far as these are made to exclude value. Accordingly we find that Humanist educators do consistently set the moral aim above the intellectual, or else refuse to distinguish them. Comenius, who most exalts "Pansophy," is assuredly convinced, with Socrates, that virtue is knowledge. His own definition of the educational ideal is "se (et secum omnia) nosse, regere, ad

Deum dirigere." Herbart most nearly approaches him in this exaltation of knowledge for the sake of goodness. "The stupid man cannot be virtuous." Others lay less stress on the means, and are even, comparatively, careless of information. "The one and the whole work of education," says Pestalozzi, "may be summed up in the concept, morality." And this is the spirit of Arnold and of Thring, whose was "the ever-present conviction that the business of a school is to train up men for the service of God," and to whom "in a peculiarly vivid way life presented itself as a battlefield between good and evil." Most interesting is Luther's position, who puts the religious and moral purpose first, but asserts more forcibly than any one the supreme value of education for the whole of life, "were there neither soul, heaven, nor hell." A few years later Ascham, the typical English Humanist of the earlier School, sets down in order the schoolmaster's objects: "God's fear," "honesty of life," "perfectness of learning," and adds the requirement of gymnastics for all, and of much recreation for the "best wits," though he thinks that "base and dumpish wits can never be hurt by continual study." We are brought back to our first and foremost principle of balance, and it is needless to multiply the quotations of Humanists. Professor Laurie's summarising words are our best conclusion: "If the intellectual aim is always the same with the best writers, so even still more are they at one on the supreme importance of the moral aim and the value of gymnastic."

Professor Muirhead has contributed a preface to the volume. It is worth that, although it needs no sponsor. In the preface, however, he has the good taste to leave the book to speak for itself. He says something of his own. He appeals for the place of the humanist (who is the enemy of the militarist) in the lean years that are to succeed the war. 'One of the chief lessons of the war, it is generally held, has been the unpreparedness in which we were caught at the outset, and for which the vague Humanism that has hampered patriotic effort in the past is largely responsible. After the war, moreover, we may be sure there will everywhere be a call for the strictest economy, and the country will be in no mood for increased expenditure on education. I believe that these arguments, so far from deterring, ought to act as an incentive to reformers to make themselves articulate. With regard to the first, I am prepared to agree that

things are no longer what they were. The old policy of splendid isolation, I believe, is no longer possible. With the rise of great democratic nations sharing the same ideals, new obligations have arisen for each—more particularly that of enforcing treaties and maintaining public law in the common interest. If, as may be hoped, the more advanced nations more and more recognise the necessity of organising themselves for this purpose, England will have to play her full part in the future policy of the world. This will not mean the acceptance of the continental system of conscription; but it may mean some form of universal compulsory military training in schools and colleges, factories, businesses, and warehouses. If this comes to pass in an educational atmosphere imperfectly permeated with humanistic ideas, there may be a real danger of fostering the military spirit. There is only one effective way of meeting this danger—to complete the permeation. This is the answer to those who would have Humanists lie low at the present juncture.'

Messrs. Allen & Unwin have issued a new edition of Annette M. B. Meakin's *In Russian Turkestan* (3s. 6d. net). It is issued 'to meet the sudden demand made by the British public for information about Russia.' It is not likely to satisfy that demand, for it deals with only a part of the vast empire, and it is so pleasantly written that it will whet the appetite for more.

* There is scarcely a New Testament problem, if there is any life in it, that has escaped the Rev. W. Douglass Reid, B.D., and every problem is dealt with fairly and masterfully. He tells us that his original purpose was to discuss simply the doctrine of the Person of Christ in the Pauline Epistles. But the book grew, and now he calls it comprehensively *Jesus the Christ and Paul the Apostle in the Light of Modern Criticism* (Brown & Sons; 2s. 6d. net). At the end of the book—it is one of the few books that come to an end just when the interest is keenest—there are many pages of references and a most useful and accurate bibliography.

At the Cambridge University Press there is published the first number of a new quarterly journal—*The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking*.

It is one of the numerous periodicals issued by the University of Chicago. Could such a periodical have been published in this country? Would it have been thought of? No, because we have never supposed that the public speaker could be made any more than the poet. The Americans believe that he can. How far ahead America has gone will be painfully evident to the British reader on looking into this handsome first number. Two of its articles deal with 'Research in Public Speaking.' Did you ever hear of such a thing? Another article is on 'Preparing Literary Material for Public Utterance.' We can understand a little about that. But then what has Public Speaking to do with 'An Experiment with the Referendum'?

The seventeenth Hartley Lecture was delivered by the Rev. James P. Langham. Its title is *The Supreme Quest* (Hammond; 2s. 6d.). There is also a subtitle: 'The Nature and Practice of Mystical Religion.' So it is another volume on Mysticism. Is it any the worse of that? It depends on what sort of mysticism it recommends. We have had books enough on a kind of mysticism that has nothing to do with Christ. That is not the mysticism of Mr. Langham. Christ is the only real and living way to the Father, as Dr. Moffatt translates the text in St. John. There is no passing Him by as if superfluous. Indeed, Mr. Langham scarcely distinguishes 'mystical' from 'spiritual'; and his book is an earnest appeal for a new and spiritual life, a life which is to be obtained only by faith in Jesus Christ. He does not stay with Christ—if the words may be used inoffensively. He comes to the Father. The supreme quest, he says, is 'to know the love of God, which passeth knowledge.' And the end of that, we know, is to be filled up to all the fulness of God. This is 'mystical religion.' To the practice of it Mr. Langham offers many suggestions, such as the religious use of the Bible, interior prayer, and daily use of pure intention.

There are three great preachers of our day whose name is John MacNeill. There may be a difference in the way the Mac is printed, or in the number of the l's, but the pronunciation is the same. One is a Scotsman, one an Australian, one a Canadian. The Canadian has published a volume of war sermons. From first to last they are war sermons, with all the joy of battle which

a Canadian congregation approves of, and with all the indignation which a righteous Canadian pastor feels for the enemy 'that hath done this.'

Mr. MacNeill has a wonderful gift for discovering the appropriate text. Does he determine to preach on 'A Place in the Sun'? His text is, 'And I saw an angel standing in the sun' (Rev 19¹⁷). Is his theme 'The Day'? His text is, 'Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord: to what end is it for you? the day of the Lord is darkness, and not light' (Am 5¹⁸).

The title of the book is *World-Power: The Empire of Christ* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.).

The Epistle to the Ephesians is extraordinarily rich in Commentaries. Nevertheless we welcome gladly a new commentary by the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, D.D. For it does not follow on the lines of any of the commentaries which have gone before it: and its own line is highly important. The title is *God in Christ Jesus* (Kelly; 5s. net).

Dr. Lidgett's method is to find out first what is the leading theme of the Epistle, and then to keep it clearly before him in all the exposition. 'Just as the unity of the Epistle to the Romans is to be found by treating it as an exposition of the Righteousness of God as revealed in the gospel, so, as it appears to me, the Epistle to the Ephesians will be seen to possess an even more closely integrated unity if it be treated as an expatiation on the subject of God in Christ Jesus. It is from this point of view that I have dealt with the Epistle in the following pages.'

This introduces the question of the authorship. For Dr. Lidgett sees clearly enough that the question of the Pauline authorship of Ephesians turns, not on matters of language or style, but on the ideas that are governmental in it. In the Epistle to the Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans the outstanding term is Righteousness. This is absent from the Epistle to the Ephesians. 'Grace, indeed, is magnified and the experience of the forgiveness of sins is set forth, but the term righteousness and the cluster of words springing out of it are not employed. Instead, the whole emphasis is laid upon life, and salvation is treated as a quickening by which believers enter into the resurrection of Christ and share His risen life. In connexion with and in subordination to this governing conception salvation is portrayed under the conception of spiritual illumination.'

And yet Dr. Lidgett believes that St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Ephesians. His reasons do not need to be repeated. It is enough to say that they are good reasons and temperately set forth.

But the triumph of the book is in this, that while the central theme of the Epistle is always present, each step in the elucidation of it is treated with distinctness, so that a passage can be chosen anywhere and the exposition of it detached and enjoyed almost as if it were complete in itself.

The most recent of the Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity Publications are: (1) *Religion and Morality*, by the Bishop of Winchester (6d. net); *The Sacraments of the Gospel*, by Canon J. G. Simpson (1s. net); and *The Verification of Christian Faith in Experience*, by Canon J. T. Mitchell (6d. net). Canon Simpson offers a powerful plea for an evangelical interpretation of the Sacraments, especially of the Eucharist. It is a small book to be seriously reckoned with.

The Eternal Saviour-Judge, by the Rev. James Langton Clarke, M.A., D.D., was well received on its appearance in 1904, and received considerable attention in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. A shortened, simplified, and cheaper edition has now been issued (Murray; 1s. net).

A valuable book on *The Cure of Self-Consciousness* has been published by Messrs. Andrew Reid & Company of Newcastle upon Tyne (3s. 6d. net). The author is Mr. James Alexander. It is valuable because its rules and recommendations are all based on a good psychological knowledge of human nature, and call constantly upon the human will for co-operation and conquest. Every variety of self-consciousness and every result of it is diagnosed and prescribed for. Mr. Alexander is sorry for the man or woman who blushes too easily, but he is still more sorry for the man or woman who never blushes.

The Rev. W. E. Sellers has been in communication with the chaplains at the front—the chaplains of all ecclesiastical denominations—and he has gathered from them their experiences, to which he has added his own, and has produced a remarkably interesting and sometimes quite thrilling volume, which he has published under the title of *With Our Fighting Men* (R.T.S.; 2s. 6d. net). For

the most part it is the record of the reception of Christ, whether slowly, after much thought in the trenches, or suddenly, in the act of daring or even the article of death.

Mr. Robert Scott has published a cheap edition of *The Roman Catholic Church in Italy*, by the Rev. Alexander Robertson, D.D. (2s. net). Dr. Robertson has lived his life in Venice and has studied the ecclesiastical situation all the time. This is the seventh edition of the book.

In the year 1911 the Rev. G. B. H. Bishop, Vicar of Cardington, Salop, spent five months in a remote district of 'Little Russia the Blessed,' about one thousand miles from Petrograd. And now he has written a book on *The Religion of Russia* (London: Soc. of SS. Peter and Paul; 5s. net). He acknowledges that 'in so short a time it was possible to gain only a superficial knowledge of the people and their national institutions,' but he has written popularly, believing that if his knowledge is small ours is less, and he has submitted his book to experts.

He writes most sympathetically. For he is an Anglican who looks towards the East for that appreciation which is denied him in the West; and, besides, he was well treated by the parish priest. 'His eagerness to meet my wishes in every way was on one occasion a source of great embarrassment to me. I happened to be passing the church just as a funeral procession headed by cross-bearer and bannerers was setting out for the cemetery. Thinking myself unnoticed I prepared to photograph the scene, when to my horror Bátushka Johann called a halt, and the whole party, including the mourners, posed for their portraits with the corpse in the centre!'

The book is written with much simplicity and pleasantness. Its illustrations add greatly to its general charm.

From the same Society there comes a little book by Mr. Ronald Knox, Fellow and Chaplain of Trinity College, Oxford, on *Impetrative Prayer*. The title of it is *Bread or Stone*. Impetrative Prayer is prayer 'which is directed in the first instance, not towards the discipline of our own souls in a particular attitude, or the enjoyment of union with God, but towards the obtaining of special favours from Him, whether for ourselves or for others.'

The Rev. J. Politeyan, B.A., has written a book on *Biblical Discoveries in Egypt, Palestine, and Mesopotamia*, and Canon R. B. Girdlestone has introduced it to its readers (Elliot Stock; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Politeyan believes that the Old Testament (he says nothing about the New) cannot be understood until its setting, its geographical and historical setting, is caught and comprehended. And he is very right. *East is East and West is West*, even though Mr. Kipling said so. We have to obtain the proper angle, more than that, almost a new personality, if we are not grievously to misjudge the Hebrews and their God. This it is that Mr. Politeyan provides. His book is thoroughly well illustrated.

From the Student Christian Movement there comes *A Book of Prayers for Students* (1s. 6d. net). It contains three parts. Part I. consists of a Service for each day of the week, which may be used either privately or for corporate prayer. Part II. contains a few Litanies; and Part III. a collection of Collects for use in relation to special needs or on special occasions.

The Implications of the Golden Rule.

By THE REV. E. W. HIRST, M.A.(LOND.), B.Sc.(OXON.), GLASGOW.

I. It is at the outset a matter of great significance that the Golden Rule distinctly contemplates man in society. The classical moralists have been far too prone to consider the individual *in vacuo* abstracted from all relation to his fellows. They have regarded him as though he were the inhabitant

of a desert island, and as if he could be 'good' all alone. But according to the N.T. idea of goodness, and according to the implication of the Golden Rule in particular, a Robinson Crusoe could not, strictly speaking, be 'good.' Religious he might be. Day by day he might fall down on

his knees and pray to God. But as for 'morality,'—there would be no one round him with whom he could practise goodness, no one to whom he could act as he would have them act to him. And it is the defect of the text-books on ethics, and of the classical moralists, that these books and teachers view man as an individual, whose conduct is supposed to be as individual a thing as his health. Even Kant is an offender in this respect, in that he considered the essence of goodness to lie in actions which all other individuals besides the doer have merely to imitate or 'universalize.' No doubt he does seem at times to treat other individuals somewhat less externally, especially in the formula that says: 'So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of another, in any case as an end withal, never as a means only.' Indeed, Professor Votaw (*Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, Ext. p. 42a), likens the Golden Rule to this version of the Categorical Imperative.

And yet it is far from clear that this Kantian formula relates the *alter* to the *ego* in anything like the intimate way in which their connexion is regarded by the Golden Rule. In fact, the whole ethical teaching of Kant is vitiated by an imperfect doctrine of personality, by the idea that all selves are impervious, and are so many spiritual monads. It is claimed that each of these selves is an 'end' to itself because each possesses 'reason.' When, however, we inquire what it is to treat other persons as 'ends,' we are told by Kant that we cannot directly further their 'perfection' or 'self-realization,' but may contribute to their happiness only, though in treating ourselves as 'ends' we must seek our own 'perfection'—a purely individual pursuit. In spite of appearances to the contrary, Kant never establishes between ego and alter any intimate relationship. The underlying implication throughout is that selves are atomic and independent, and that morality is mono-personal. Therefore the identification of the Golden Rule with the Categorical Imperative seems hardly justified. For the former regards goodness, as the latter does not, as essentially inter-personal and social.¹

¹ No doubt Hegel emphasized the close relation of the individual to his fellows, and regarded society as a 'moral organism.' But in becoming 'organic' in Hegel's sense, the individual ceases to have existence for self, and the 'whole' for which he exists is not strictly 'moral,' inasmuch as its nature is at any time inevitable.

II. The Golden Rule has had plenty of critics. Perhaps the criticism that is most frequently urged is the one mentioned by Professor Henry Sidgwick, to the effect that the rule does not forbid reciprocity in evil. Each member of a band of thieves—to take the usual instance—shows to his comrade in crime the same loyalty which he desires to have shown to himself. Little discernment, however, is required to see that such robbers do not apply the Golden Rule in any real and universal way. They refrain from robbing one another just because they are thieves and desire each their share of spoil, not because they are men. If they refrained from robbing one another on the ground that they are men, for the same reason they would refrain from robbing any one else. We are to do, not simply to five or six particular men just the particular thing we want them to do to us, but we are to do unto man as man anywhere what we would have any and every man do to us.

III. In the *Hibbert Journal* for January 1914, Sir F. Younghusband makes another attack upon the Golden Rule. 'It cannot be said,' he writes, 'that the Golden Rule represents perfection, for men have gone further still, and not in theory only, but in actual practice. There have been many men, and probably still more women, who have loved their neighbours, not merely as themselves, but far more than themselves: who have given up their lives, not only in death, but, better still, in life, for their neighbours, for loved individuals, for their country, for humanity. Now they have not merely done unto others as they would that others should do unto them, but have done unto others a great deal more than they would ever expect others to do for them.'

Undenially, circumstances do arise in which it may be one's duty to neglect oneself for others' sake, and even to surrender life itself. And this conduct is not necessarily incompatible with the Golden Rule. Of course, such circumstances must be exceptional. For if every person died for his neighbour, soon no neighbour would be left for whom to die. Or if every person merely weakened himself in health, or neglected his business or his culture, soon there would be no one left in the position of helper, for all alike would, in such a case, have become needy and helpless. Such an unequal love of neighbour, if universalized, becomes impracticable and absurd. Self-sacrifice, of course,

there must always be, but this involves not the immolation so much as the socialization of the self.

IV. A subtle interpretation of the Golden Rule has been given by Dr. A. T. Cadoux in the *International Journal of Ethics* for April 1912. He contends that the Rule starts from, and bases itself upon the desires of the individual—'Whatsoever ye would.' It does not, however, concern itself with the satisfaction of the individual's desires in any direct manner, but of these desires after they have been 'transferred in imagination to one's neighbour'—'Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them.' Cadoux then goes on to show how different desires are modified and enhanced by such a process. For instance, the desire for the praise of others, when, in accordance with the Golden Rule, it leads us to bestow praise on them, reacts upon our own fondness for praise, purifies it into the desire for genuine as distinguished from verbal appreciation, which desire in turn leads us ourselves to bestow on others appreciation that is sincere. In this way the pleasure of both giver and receiver is increased. The same process is illustrated in the case of the love of beauty, the desire for health, and the wish for happiness.

Now it is only necessary to read between the lines to see that, in so far as such a process of comparison results in a better treatment of others, it does so in virtue of an altruistic impulse which the process assumes to exist rather than creates. And the comparison is made primarily for the purpose of modifying the desires of the individual in such a way as to bring about their increase, and maximum satisfaction. The Golden Rule is used to provide a universal social reference such as will give to the desires of the individual, form, scale, and breadth.

But the Golden Rule in being so used appears misused. It becomes merely a means to enhance personal satisfaction, and is thus quite consistent with a doctrine of Egoism. We take it to be much more than a recipe for obtaining individual 'good,' 'life,' or 'satisfaction.' For it makes no direct reference to the content of the actual desires which any one may feel. Its real concern is that desires should be socialized, and that this should be done as an end in itself. It teaches that, as between ourselves and others, there should be impartiality of regard.

V. It is an important question whether this impartial regard is equivalent to a doctrine of equality. The idea of the essential equality of men is certainly very old. It received impressive endorsement from the Stoics. Cicero, in particular, insisted on it, and, like others, based it upon the fact that all men possess reason. The doctrine was dramatically re-emphasized at the French Revolution. Indeed, throughout the history of civilization the idea has had its influence. It is, for instance, the root conception of administrative justice—which should be 'equal,' *i.e.* impartial. Politically as well as legally the idea has done good service, forming the basis of the theory of representative government. And probably for a long time we shall still have to use the notion for all that it is worth. Nevertheless it would appear to be a makeshift. Its inadequacy is inevitable; for the idea of equality is quantitative, while human nature is pre-eminently qualitative. There is, of course, no sort of physical or intellectual equality possible to men. Neither could there be an equality of circumstances. People must live in different countries and climates and conditions. Utopia, too, will need both scavengers and scholars. Moreover, the relations in which people stand to one another as master and servant, parent and child, teacher and pupil, necessarily preclude any exact similarity in the details of behaviour.

Equality of opportunity is, no doubt, a plausible ideal. But it would be foolish to treat all people alike without regard to sex, health, sanity, and race. And whatever initial opportunity is used for the purpose of classifying men must be crude and practically momentary, for diversity of endowment and morale will at once demand diversity of opportunity. For in Utopia different people will be doing different things and must be accorded different kinds of chances for learning these different things.

The idea which is characteristic of Christianity is not the equality but the unity of life. According to St. Paul, we all form one body, which body is none other than the body of Christ. In the New Testament, also, men are regarded as brothers in a great house of life in which God is the Father of all. And that impartial regard for one another which the Golden Rule inculcates finds its justification, not in the fact that men possess reason or personality, or have an equal capacity for 'virtue'—there appears to be nothing intrinsically grand

either in rationality or in personality—but in this great truth of the unity of all life and the brotherhood of all men.

Now the ideal principle in a perfect brotherhood is surely 'From every one according to his ability: to every one according to his needs.' Some who think this maxim rather dangerous would substitute the word 'services' for 'needs.' But in an ideal condition of things no one would be pauperized by being merely a receiver of the bounty of others, for all would be givers as well as receivers, each giving of the kind that he has, and receiving of the kind of which he is in want. Such a state would, of course, be consistent with great inequalities. Some will give more, and some will receive more. But if all are one, and realize their unity, this will neither matter nor be felt to matter. Any other principle like that of 'reward' for services it is impossible satisfactorily to apply, as Dr. Rashdall has cleverly shown (*Theory of Good and Evil*, vol. i. chap. viii.). Rashdall abandons as hopeless the maxim 'to every man according to his merit,' and adopts what he calls the principle of 'equality of consideration'—meaning thereby that the distribution of the goods of life should be according to the needs of men as these are socially determined.

And in the ideal commonwealth each one would receive eagerly in order that he might the better give. Should a gift to the uttermost be asked of a man—even the gift of his blood, as in the case of the present European war—the principle of the solidarity of life will inspire him as no abstract

principle of equality could. He will see that he is given innumerable blessings for which he never laboured, and is called to sufferings not always on his own behalf, but often for the sake of others, filling up in this way what is lacking in the sufferings of Christ.

A community inspired by the principle of unity—unity with one another and with God in Christ—will express itself through a State. That is to say, it will not be anarchist. Justice, however, will be swallowed up in love. This love will not take the form of charity, giving to your neighbours something for which he gives you no return. For all will have something to give, and love will express itself in such a system of exchange as will bless all with mutual benefits.¹

Finally, love will be not the product of such a State, but its condition. A non-competitive society is possible or ultimately successful only when the human heart has ceased to feel the competitive spirit. To merge possessions is not necessarily to merge souls. And so the hope of the future can lie only in the greater prevalence of the spirit that desires to give rather than to get. Experience leads us to expect little from a mere social instinct or 'group-mind.' But love will prevail, we believe, when there is a greater realization by all men of their essential union with each other in God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

¹ In the same way, Ruskin, following Plato, maintained that wealth is an instrument of 'life,' and is to be shared co-operatively, as in a household.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

Chapter ix.

18. Since Shem corresponds with Samu or Sumu, the ancestral god of the 'Amorite' or West Semitic kings of Babylonia, while Japhet is Iapetos, a Cilician deity (Steph. Byz. *sub voce* Ἀδάρα), it would seem to follow that in Ham also we ought to find the name of a deity. As 'father of Canaan,' the deity would be Canaanite. Ham, however, was also the father of Mizraim or Egypt, with which in the O.T. the name is sometimes

synonymous, but there is nothing in the Egyptian pantheon with which the name can be compared. It is, therefore, possible that the Canaanite Ham has been identified with Qem, a name given to Egypt in the inscriptions, since in proper names Egyptian *q* may represent Assyro-Babylonian *kh* (π) when the latter stands for West Semitic *ghain*. In this case the identification would have resulted from the use of the cuneiform script. In the

Mosaic age Canaan was a province of Egypt, and hence geographically connected with it.

20. 'Noah was the first husbandman.' Here we have an account of the origin of agriculture, for which see notes on 4¹ and 5²⁹. The transference of the reputation of being the first UR-ENGAR, or 'man of the soil,' from Adam or Cain to Noah seems to be due to the fact that the account of the origin of agriculture was combined with an account of the origin of grape-wine. The vine was native to the Armenian highlands, from which it was carried to Babylonia (in Sumerian times) and Canaan. In the Armenian highlands, therefore, the first grape-wine will have been made. The Assyrian form of the verse would have been *ina yumi-su ina ris sanâti* (?) *Nukhum-[ilu?] amel ikkari ibsu-ma eris karani*. In Assyro-Babylonian *karanu* was 'vine,' *kurunnu*, 'wine'; the Heb. *kerem*, 'vineyard,' is borrowed from *karanu*. *Tîrôsh* is the Ass. *sêras*, 'new wine.' The Sumerian word for 'wine' is *gestin*, later *wüdü*. Assyrian also had the word *înu*, the Heb. *yayin*, which like the Greek *οἶνον*, Lat. *vinum*, has been borrowed from a language of Asia Minor; cf. Armenian *gini*.¹

21. Noah not only cultivated grapes, but discovered how to make them into wine. Perhaps there was a Babylonian legend on the subject, since Pliny (*N.H.* xxx. 51; cf. xxxvii. 52) states that 'the Assyrian king' Horus invented a cure for drunkenness. The Assyrian *sikaru* was 'date-wine,' corresponding with our 'beer,' whence the verb *sakâru*, 'to be drunken.' The Assyrian form of the verse would have been *kurunna isti-mma isakkir û (ur-su iptekhi) ina libbi biti-su*. *Ina libbi*, 'within,' is literally 'in the midst'; the Hebrew writer substitutes 'tent' for 'house' as elsewhere. The house of the nomad Israelite was his tent. The text, however, has 'her' instead of 'his tent,' as if there had been a previous reference to a harim.

The feeling expressed in this verse in regard to nakedness is the same as that in 2²⁵ 3⁷. From the account given of Ea-bani in the Epic of Gilgames, we may gather that it was shared by the Babylonians. It affords a contrast to the feeling of the Egyptians and Greeks on the same matter. There is a curious parallelism between the sin of Adam, the first agriculturist before the Deluge, and that of Noah, the first agriculturist after the

Deluge. Adam eat the fruit of a tree which was perhaps the vine, and so discovered that he was naked; Noah drank the wine and 'uncovered himself.' The curse, however, fell upon his offspring, not upon himself.

24. *Yêda'*, 'he knew,' is here used in the same way as *idi* in the Tel el-Amarna tablets. Though Ham is here called Noah's younger son, he is elsewhere always placed between Shem and Japhet, usually after Shem, but after Japhet in chap. 10. It is possible that there was a double tradition, one giving Noah three sons (like the three sons of Adam), the other giving him only two (like Cain and Abel). These two would have been Shem (*Šamu*) and Ham (*Khammu*), where we should have the same verbal jingle as in Jubal, Jabel, Tubal. If Ham represents the Babylonian Khammu, it would have been derived from a cuneiform text, since the initial letter in Khammu represents a West Semitic *ghain*, the name being the Heb. [חַם].

25-27. The double 'he said' indicates that we have quotations from two different poems, or from different parts of the same poem. Hence the parallelism is not the same; in the one case Canaan is cursed, in the other case it is 'the god of Shem' that is blessed. There is no reason for thinking that the name of Canaan has been substituted for that of Ham, or the name of Ham for that of Canaan; Ham was 'the father of Canaan,' and in Hebrew belief the sins of the father were visited upon the children. Consequently the Hebrew writer had no difficulty in believing that the curse embodied in the words of the old poem was the result of the action of Ham.

The description of Canaan was literally true of it in the Mosaic age. It had been a province of Babylonia; it was now nominally a province of Egypt, from whose hands it was being wrested by the Hittites from Asia Minor. Its cities and native princes were subject to the governors placed over them by the Babylonian or Egyptian or Hittite king, and thus servants 'of servants.'

The fall of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty brought with it the loss of the Egyptian empire in Asia, which passed from them to the Hittites, and though it was partially recovered by Seti I. and Ramses II., it was again lost under Menephtah, the son and successor of Ramses II. Only those verses of the old poem are quoted which refer to the Babylonian and Hittite dominations; that

¹ *Kurunnu* must have been borrowed from the same quarter, since it is the Greek *κάρπου* (Lat. *carenum*), the name of a sweet wine made in Asia Minor.

referring to the Egyptian domination has been omitted, since Egypt was regarded by the Hebrew writer as a brother of Canaan. But we may gather that there was such a reference from the statement in the first quotation that Canaan should be subject to 'his brethren.' The reference would have come between vv.²⁶ and ²⁷.

Yahweh is here stated to be 'the god of Shem'; see note on Gn 4²⁶. The founder of the dynasty to which Khammu-rabi, 'king of the land of the Amorites,' belonged was Šamu-abi, 'Shem is my father.' As Ham was the father of Canaan, so Shem was the father of the Babylonian king.

The play upon the name of Japhet—'God shall make wide (the road) for Japhet'—is made to harmonize with the political situation at the time. In the Tel el-Amarna tablets we see the Hittites descending from Asia Minor upon Syria and

Canaan, and the recently discovered tablets of Boghaz Keui complete the picture of the formation of their empire in Semitic lands. In the age of Ramses II. they were paramount in Aram, where they dwelt 'in the tents of Shem,' and Canaan had for some time been their 'servant.' Since the days when they invaded Babylonia and helped to overthrow the dynasty of Khammu-rabi, the road into the region of Shem had indeed been 'made wide' for them.

In these fragments of an old poem or poems there are no traces of a Babylonian original.

28. Cf. the title of the list of early Babylonian kings in the tablet which interprets their names, *annutum sarrê sa arki abubi*, 'these are the kings who were after the deluge.' As Noah was not a 'king'—the first king being Nimrod—he 'lived' only, and did not 'reign.'

Contributions and Comments.

'Danaïds and Dirces' in the Epistle of Clement to Corinth.

ALL students of the Apostolic Fathers are familiar with the perplexing statement near the beginning of chap. vi. in the Epistle of Clement of Rome.

διὰ ζήλος διωχθεῖσαι γυναῖκες Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι αἰκίσματα δεινὰ καὶ ἀνόσια παθοῦσαι, ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς πίστεως βέβαιον δρόμον κατήντησαν, καὶ ἔλαβον γέρας γενναῖον, αἱ ἀσθενεῖς τῷ σώματι.

'It was by reason of jealousy that women being persecuted, after having suffered horrible and unholy outrages as Danaïds and Dirces, attained to the sure course of faith and won a noble reward, weak though they were in body.'

'Attained to the sure course' is not a very obvious expression, and the exact meaning of it is not clear. Apparently it means the point in the race at which victory becomes sure, namely, the goal, or somewhere near the goal. The precise signification of the phrase is not of importance for understanding the sentence as a whole, but one would like to see what suggested the expression to Clement.

The difficulty of the passage, however, lies earlier in the sentence. What is the meaning of *Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι* as designating Christian women who

suffered in the Neronian persecution? The words may be taken either with *διωχθεῖσαι* or with *παθοῦσαι*, and the meaning is much the same whichever construction we adopt.

The common explanation is that it refers to the monstrous practice, specially common under Nero and Domitian, of turning the punishment of criminals into dramatic scenes for the entertainment of the cruel by making the condemned person play the part of some sufferer in mythology. Lightfoot (*Clement of Rome*, ii. p. 32) gives illustrations. 'Thus one offender would represent Hercules burnt in the flames on Ceta (Tertull. *Apol.* 15, *qui vivus ardebat Herculem induerat*); another, Ixion tortured on the wheel (*de Pudic.* 22, *puta in axe jam incendio adstructo*). We read also of criminals who, having been exhibited in the character of Orpheus (Martial. *Spec.* 21), or of Daedalus (*ib.* 8), or of Atys (Tertull. *Apol.* 15), were finally torn to pieces by wild beasts. The story of Dirce, tied by the hair and dragged along by the bull, would be very appropriate for this treatment; but all attempts to make anything of the legend of the Danaïds entirely fail.' Renan, who again and again adopts this explanation as the right one (*L'Antechrist*, pp. 167, 169, 173, 182, 187), admits that *Il est difficile de dire en quoi la*

fable des Danaïdes pouvait fournir un tableau sanglant (p. 169). Dr. Chr. Wordsworth (*Conjectural Emendations*, p. 18) was of the same opinion: 'It is not easy to see how Christian women could be made to represent the punishment of the daughters of Danaus, fifty in number, drawing water in vessels pierced with holes, and to reproduce what Horace calls (3 *Carm.* iii. 15) *notas Virginum poenas et inane lymphæ Dolium fundo pereuntis imo Seraque fata*; nor would such a penalty, exemplifying the efforts of fruitless labour, be ministerial to purposes of persecution.' He therefore rejected the established reading as a primitive error to be emended conjecturally. In his edition of Theocritus (Camb. 1844) he made the brilliant suggestion that instead of γυναικες Δαναίδες καὶ Δίρκαι we ought to read γυναικες, νεανίδες, παιδίσκαι—'women, maidens, slave-girls.' The combination of the terms and the order in which they come are both of a very attractive character. The purpose of the chapter is to show that, in the persecutions, Christian women exhibited as much heroism as Christian men, and the three terms are all feminine and form a climax; not only adult women, but also tender maidens, and even slave-girls (whose surroundings are not such as to produce lofty characters), manifested this heroic endurance. Moreover, when written in uncials, the emendation does not differ widely from the established reading. The number of letters is the same, seventeen in all, and the majority of them remain unchanged: ΔΑΝΑΙΔΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΡΚΑΙ—ΝΕΑΝΙΔΕΣ ΠΑΙΔΙΣΚΑΙ. It is not incredible that, in the parent MS. from which our two Greek authorities and our two ancient versions (Syriac and Latin) are derived, the three words were substituted for the two. Strangely enough, in 1853 Mr. Basil H. Cooper, quite independently, suggested the same emendation in the *Monthly Christian Spectator*; and, when he heard of Wordsworth's emendation, was at first inclined to believe that it had been borrowed from himself.

This suggestion, thus doubly fathered, has met with much approval from competent judges; Baron Bunsen, in his *Hippolytus* (i. p. xviii, ed. 2, 1854), adopted it with delight, as freeing a beautiful passage from two monstrosities. Bishop Jacobson, in his *Patres Apostolici* (i. pp. 31, 32, ed. 4, 1863), declared it to be quite the best of the numerous emendations which had been proposed. Bishop Lightfoot, in his first edition of *Clement* (Macmillan,

1869), placed it in his text; in his second (1890) he restored and obelized the old reading, stating in his notes that he was 'disposed still to favour the acute emendation of Wordsworth.'

But there has not been general acceptance of it. Tischendorf thought it somewhat too free, *liberrima conjectura*. R. A. Lipsius, in reviewing Lightfoot's first edition in the *Academy* (July 9, 1870, p. 256), placed it among passages which 'are really improved in the new edition.' He praised it as a 'clever conjecture,' but he did not say that he believed it to be right. Donaldson thought it admirable; but in 1877 (*Theol. Rev.* Jan. p. 44) he proposed γυναικαὶ τε καὶ δοῦλαι as perhaps better. Gebhardt and Harnack in their edition of the epistle (Lipsiae, 1876) retain the old reading, without mentioning Wordsworth's emendation, although they think it possible that the old reading is corrupt.

Perhaps the old reading would have been regarded with more favour if it had not been generally supposed that the only way in which Christian women could be made to act the part of the daughters of Danaus would be in having to carry water perpetually in vessels full of holes. That was the punishment inflicted upon them in Hades for having, in obedience to their father's command, murdered their husbands immediately after marriage. Why go to Hades for suggestions of torment, when human life is full of such things? It was in this world that Dirce was tied to a bull and dragged till she died, this being the vengeance which Amphion and his brother took for Dirce's cruel treatment of their mother Antiope. Hence the celebrated group known as the Farnese bull, the work of Apollonius and Tauriscus, now at Naples. In the stories about the lives of the daughters of Danaus we can find what would serve the persecutors' purpose, when they were looking for mythological precedents for αἰκίσματα δευρὰ καὶ ἀνόσια to be inflicted on Christian women. Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 44) tells us that there was a desire to inflict *ludibria*.

Danaus found that it was difficult to secure second husbands for the daughters who had obeyed him in killing their first bridegrooms, and Pindar (*Pyth.* ix. 117 f.) records how 'Danaus of Argos devised a very speedy wedding for his virgin daughters, ere midday had come upon them.' He placed all of them 'at the end of the race-course,' and declared that 'a contest of speed'

should decide which maiden each man should have who came as a suitor for them. Is it not possible that, in a similar way, Christian women and girls were exposed in the amphitheatre to be run for by the ruffians of Rome?

If we decide that the reading of the MSS and Versions is to be retained, and that the passage in Pindar gives the key to the right interpretation of 'Danaiids,' namely, that Christian women were set up as prizes for those who chose to race for them in the amphitheatre, then we see how natural are the words that follow. Clement might no doubt quite readily have used metaphors taken from the racecourse, even if he had not just written something which reminded him of racing; but he would be specially likely to do so if he had been thinking of Christian women outraged by 'being given away as prizes to runners. There is little doubt that, when Pindar sang of 'a very speedy wedding' for the Danaids, he was thinking of the 'contest of speed' that was to decide whom each of them was to have as a husband; and it is not improbable that the thought of Christian women being raced for as prizes led Clement to speak of them as having 'attained to the sure course and received a noble reward.'

A. PLUMMER.

Amos vi. 2.

THIS verse has been regarded as difficult, and many modern commentators consider it as a later insertion (see commentaries, especially Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 1903, p. 154 f.; Marti, *Das Dodekapropheten*, 1904, p. 199; and Harper, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea*, in 'The International Critical Commentary,' 1905, pp. 142, 144 ff.). It is held that the meaning of this verse is not clear, and that it interrupts the connexion of ideas between v.¹ and vv.^{3ff.} Two different interpretations have been given to this verse. One interpretation (given by Rashi and Kimhi, and followed, among moderns, by Ewald, Hitzig, Keil, Driver, and others) is that the prophet tells the nobles of Zion and Samaria to look round and to see whether any cities they know, as, for instance, the three cities mentioned in v.², are more flourishing than their own cities. The inference would then be: your prosperity is so great and still you have no fear of God. Against this interpretation it is objected that—(1) if the prophet

had intended to point to the glory of other cities (or kingdoms) he would not have chosen as examples such small kingdoms as those mentioned in v.²; (2) 'these kingdoms' cannot mean Judah and Israel, but must refer to Calneh, Hamath, and Gath (see Nowack, Marti, Harper, and the commentators quoted by them). These objections are, indeed, difficult to overcome. Furthermore, would Amos have intended to say what this interpretation wants him to say, he would have expressed himself more clearly. Amos is sometimes very short. He sometimes uses phrases which are very pregnant, almost fragmentary. A gesture, a thought hinted at, is often part of a sentence. But Amos never expresses himself in a way which is unintelligible. Again, if Amos had meant what this interpretation suggests, we would have expected **הַטּוֹבִים הֵם**, or, still better, **הַטּוֹבוֹת הֵן** instead of **הַטּוֹבִים**. Then it is really impossible that **הַמְּמַלְכוֹת הָאֵלֶּה** should refer to Zion and Samaria. This interpretation must therefore be regarded as inadmissible.

The second interpretation is: Amos mentions the three cities as examples of fallen greatness. The prophet says: If these cities, which have been so flourishing, have fallen, you are sure to have the same end. Most of the modern commentators (Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, Harper, and others) favour this interpretation. They compare Nah 3^{8ff.} and 2 K 19¹³, where such ideas are expressed. Finding the wording of the verse too inconvenient for this interpretation, they insert **אֲהֵם** after **הַטּוֹבִים** and read **אֲהֵם רַב נְבֻלָּם מִנְּבֻלָּם** instead of **אֲהֵם רַב נְבֻלָּם מִנְּבֻלָּם**. But this interpretation, too, must be regarded as impossible. The text has not got **אֲהֵם** after **הַטּוֹבִים**, neither has it **אֲהֵם רַב נְבֻלָּם מִנְּבֻלָּם**. The change is quite arbitrary and unwarranted. But, quite apart from this textual objection, can it be seriously assumed that the prophet (or, if it is an insertion, any other Hebrew writer) would have expressed himself so obscurely? The passages which are compared have that idea clearly stated. Cf. Nah 3^{8, 9, 10, 11}. There the fate of the cities mentioned as examples is stated. The same is the case in 2 K 19¹¹⁻¹³. But our verse has not the slightest reference to such an idea as that suggested by this interpretation. There are also historical difficulties, for which see Driver, *The Books of Joel and Amos*, p. 192. This interpretation must therefore also be rejected.

It occurs to me, however, that the verse has been made more difficult than it really is. I believe

that the following interpretation, which I venture to suggest, furnishes a satisfactory sense for the verse as it stands.

The whole section (vv.¹⁻⁷) is addressed by the prophet to the nobles of Zion and Samaria. According to the two explanations mentioned above, v.² would be an exception and therefore form a break between v.¹ and vv.^{3ff.} This is the main cause of all the difficulties found in this verse (see Harper, *l.c.*). In vv.^{1.3.4.5.6} the idleness, injustice, and luxury of those nobles are described, and in v.⁷ their fate (captivity) is announced. V.² interrupts the course of ideas. Now it appears to me that v.² also deals with the state of the nobles. In v.^{1a} the nobles are described as being 'at ease in Zion, and secure in the mountain of Samaria.' In v.^{1b} they are called 'the men of mark of the first of the nations, to whom the house of Israel come (for judgment, for guidance).' Now the prophet tells these nobles in v.² that in Calneh, Hamath the great, and Gath of the Philistines, *they will not find greater nobles than they are*. In v.² the prophet justifies his calling them נקבי ראשית הנוהים, and thus amplifies what he said about them in v.¹. Go to these other kingdoms, he tells them, and see whether their nobles have larger estates than you have, whether their prosperity is greater than your prosperity. V.² is then to be translated in this way:

'Pass over to Calneh and see, and go thence to Hamath the great (and see), and go down to Gath of the Philistines (and see) the good (prosperous) ones (*i.e.* the nobles) of these kingdoms (and see) whether their border (their estates) is greater than your border (your estates).'

V.² is thus merely a continuation of v.¹. Far from being an interruption 'in the transition of thought from v.¹ to v.³' (Harper), it is an amplification of the ideas expressed in v.¹. Thus *all* the six verses (¹⁻⁶) contain a description of the prosperity, hardness, and luxury of the nobles of Judah and Israel.

I take the ה טובים as an article, and טובים as a designation of the nobles of those three kingdoms (מן הממלכות האלה). The Septuagint, the Syriac translation, and the Vulgate, also take the ה in טובים as an article. Only they refer טובים to the kingdoms, which is unsatisfactory. But they thus give to טובים the same meaning as I give: the prosperous ones. I refer טובים to the nobles (of those kingdoms). No objection can be raised to

this use of the word טובים מן הממלכות. השאננים בציון והבטחים האלה is a phrase parallel to בהר שמרון. בחר שמרון has naturally to be supplemented mentally, as indicated in my translation. As to the correctness of אם (without preceding ה) see Kautzsch's edition of Gesenius' *Hebräische Grammatik* (1902), p. 483. No grammatical or linguistic difficulties, therefore, stand in the way of my explanation of v.².

According to my explanation all exegetical difficulties disappear, the text remains intact, the sense is entirely satisfactory, and the verse (²) is seen to be an integral part of the whole section (¹⁻⁷), the meaning of which is now perfectly clear.

SAMUEL DAICHES.

Jews' College, London.

Σαββατισμός.

HE 3⁷⁻⁴¹³ is generally recognized as an intricate passage. The course of thought reminds one of a stream that occasionally flows underground. Thus something disappears from our view between 4⁷ and 4⁸. The general argument of the preceding verses turns upon the unbelief of the Israelites in their wanderings through the wilderness. It takes a fresh start from 4⁶, 'Seeing therefore it remaineth that some should enter into (God's rest), and they to whom the good tidings were before preached failed to enter in . . . he again defineth a certain day, saying in David, after so long a time, To-day . . . if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts.' The passage 'in David' (Ps 95) is said to be a lyric of 'Israel's Renaissance' (A. B. Davidson)—the period of the Return, and to tell of a second national day of grace when a land of promise was again offered to God's people. It is possible, however, seeing that the LXX, which the author of Hebrews here mainly follows, ascribes the Psalm to David that the reference in the Epistle is indeed to the brilliantly idealized period of the early monarchy, and to the opportunity supposed to have been granted to Israel at that time of rising to a truly religious vocation. However that may be, the main point of these verses is the non-fulfilment of God's purpose in offering His Rest to the Israel of the Exodus, and the consequent reservation of that Rest to some later day. It is here that the stream of the writer's thought dives underground. Apparently there

came into his mind the recollection that after all, though 'they to whom the good tidings were before preached failed to enter in,' their children with Caleb and Joshua did enter in—at least to the land which had been promised as a land of rest. It was written in Joshua in respect to the final settlement after the actual entering, 'So the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest (LXX—κατέπαυσεν) round about according to all that he swore unto their fathers,' etc. (21⁴³). And again, later (23¹), a κατάπαυσις had been distinctly associated with the leadership of Joshua. These explicit statements seemed to cut the ground from under the feet of our author, who, as we have seen (4⁶), had found the promised rest open to Christians because none before them had entered thereinto. He was led, therefore, to reveal his meaning by an uplifting movement of thought that disentangled his idealism from the associations of the old record. With grave boldness he moves forward upon a contradiction of the letter of Scripture, saying, 'For if Joshua had given them rest, he (God) would not have spoken afterward (in David) of another day.' Then to justify his interpretation of the past, and to differentiate his ideal conception from any attainments ascribed to Joshua, he concludes by flashing upon us a word which to his readers must have been practically new. 'There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest (σαββατισμός) for the people of God.' The change from κατάπαυσις to σαββατισμός brilliantly lights up the whole passage. Perhaps it could be said that Joshua did give to those he led a κατάπαυσις. He certainly did not give a σαββατισμός. What was the difference between the two things?

σαββ. is found in the N.T. only here, nowhere in LXX, and only in one place in classical Greek. We have, however, in one of the Oxyrhynchus Logia a sentence which its editors (Drs. Grenfell and Hunt, *Sayings of our Lord*, p. 11) suggest as relevant to the verse under discussion: ἐὰν μὴ σαββατίσητε τὸ σάββατον οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα ('Except ye truly keep the Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father'). A study of the whole logion, of which this is the second part, conveys the impression that σαββατίζειν τὸ σάββατον is here metaphorical, and that the logion means that 'the Christian's whole life is to be hallowed, as a Sabbath, in the service of God.' I quote from

Dr. Driver's note in *D.B.* iv. p. 323. Dr. Swete, in an address published in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES* (viii. 546), takes the same view, which I cannot see is weakened by the contrary judgment of another writer in the succeeding volume of this journal (pp. 141–142). Now the significance of the phrase in the logion for the interpretation of σαββ. in He 4⁹ lies in its agreement with those sacramental ideas belonging to the whole Epistle which Professor Nairne has so brilliantly set before us in his work, *The Epistle of Priesthood*. We are enabled thereby to understand better the author's thought in regard to the Rest Israel failed to win. It sends us back to re-examine the original conception of the land of promise. Take, e.g., Dt 12⁹⁻¹². (We are not concerned with any Pentateuchal criticism, for this was not before the mind of the writer of the Epistle.) In such words as these—'Ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance. . . . When he giveth you rest,' etc., the idea is not merely a rest of settled politics, but of established and institutionalized religion. 'The irregular, arbitrary worship of the wilderness is not to continue indefinitely' (Driver, *in loc.*). The whole experience of Israel in the Providence that should bring her into Canaan, and especially in the worship which was then to be set up on a more glorious basis than had before been possible, was to be sacramental to her. The things that were external—the end of battle, the settled land, the ordered worship—were to be signs and seals of an invisible grace, through which God should be revealed afresh, while the grateful love of Israel to God would be her contribution to a real and intimate communion. Broadly speaking, we may say the outward elements taken alone made up the κατάπαυσις, the inward, with these, the σαββατισμός.

Now that even the Israel, which had been disciplined into some measure of faith through the wilderness wanderings, failed to receive the σαββ. was just part of that failure of all the O.T. economy of which Hebrews is full. So the unattained heavenly reality was reserved for those who should become 'partakers of Christ' (13¹).

One remaining question may be considered. How precisely are we to interpret this σαββ.? The words which immediately follow 4⁹, connecting back with 4⁴, seem to involve a very primitive idea of the Rest. It is a cessation from work, as God rested from His. But we may feel sure our

author would not be content with a literalism. The rest after creation came when God had seen that all was very good. It was a rest not so much *from* activity as *in* accomplishment. It reminds us of the exquisite word in Zephaniah—‘He will rejoice over thee with joy, he will rest in his love, he will joy over thee with singing’ (3¹⁷). It had in it something corresponding to that conception of fruition which Eucken and his disciples have made familiar to us, the idea of a life which in its strength and joy gathers up the significance of a realized end. And it is this blessedness of an eternal world, ungiven by Joshua, that remains for the people of God who are in Christ. One can see the moral of this line of the writer’s thinking all the more clearly when we remember the dangers that beset his first readers in their hankering after Levitical ritual and an institutionalized kingdom—dangers which in other forms are always with ourselves and from which only a Christ-dominated sacramentalism can set us free.

A. D. MARTIN.

Edinburgh.

Thoughts on Prayer.

WHAT is prayer? Many definitions might be given, but in all we should find that every prayer supposes two parties, one in need of something, and the other possessing the power to grant it. The prayer is uttered by the one in need to the one in power.

By this definition it would follow that if God wanted something from man, which man had the power to grant, then God might pray to man. Does He ever do so? If so, it goes far to prove the truth of the definition.

St. Paul says: ‘Now then, as ambassadors for Christ, as THOUGH GOD DID BESEECH YOU by us; we pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God.’

Again God says by Isaiah: ‘All the day long have I stretched out mine hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.’

So in the one thing man can grant or refuse, God condescends to pray to man.

But let us see what else is implied by prayer.

First, the existence of both parties is assumed. No one will pray to an abstraction. A man must believe that the object of his prayer exists before he can pray.

Second, it is assumed that the object of the prayer can hear the prayer. Otherwise it is no use praying.

Third, that he can understand the language used.

Fourth, that he has power to grant the request.

These four postulates are essential. Without them there can be no prayer.

But granting all these, although there may be prayer—as when one prays to a hard-hearted tyrant to spare some victim; praying it, yet not expecting it; taking an off-chance, as it were—unless we have more than our four postulates require, it will be cold, hopeless, ineffective prayer.

What, then, do we want more?

Fifth, a knowledge that the object of prayer is not only powerful but kind. If we could hear of other petitions He has answered, we shall present ours more hopefully.

Sixth, an encouraging word. If the object of prayer, for example, has said that we may present our petition. That very permission to present it, is in itself an assurance that the object of the prayer is favourably disposed to us, and that possibly He will grant our request.

Seventh, a promise. But this will be valuable or not according to the honesty of the object of the prayer. If he be a rogue, a crafty person, or a tyrant, he may even break a promise. So we need to know—

Eighth, that He is true and faithful.

So we need to be assured of the following things before we can effectually pray:—That the object of our prayer exists; that He can grant our prayer; that He keeps His word. Then, that He is willing to hear; ready to give and forgive; and that He has promised something.

But there is another thing needed also before prayer can be efficacious, namely, that we, on our part, REALLY WANT what we ask for. If we do not feel our need, we shall not be earnest in our prayer, for whom, or for whatever we make it.

These being the essentials, we may say that prayer to God demands FAITH—that is, a firm belief in the existence and power of God—for apart from this we shall never approach Him. And secondly, a deep sense of need, for without this we shall not be in earnest.

Then, some promise that He will hear, and some PLEDGE of His willingness. On such a pledge, we

think, our faith might be strong enough. Well, here it is: 'He that spared not *his own Son*, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?' Our pledge of what He will do is simply what He has done.

It will be noticed that I have nowhere said that emotion is required. No: for, though it frequently accompanies prayer, emotion is not prayer.

Prayer is a petition presented to one powerful enough to grant it, and effectual prayer is that same petition presented in the full assurance that He will grant it. 'Whatsoever things ye ask for, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them,' said our Lord. And this saying is absolutely true, just as true as it is that a favourite son will get whatever he asks from his father. That is, he will get it, if it is not bad for him to have it. A father, for instance, would hardly give his little son a razor however hard he begged. It might grieve him to refuse, but his love for his son would override the son's prayer. We shall assuredly have 'whatsoever

things we ask for' so long as infinite love and wisdom does not see that they would injure us. A child asks for cake and has some; asks for more and is told: 'You have had enough! more would be bad for you.' That does not hinder the fact of WILLINGNESS to grant, nor can this be called an unanswered prayer. It is answered by a denial kinder than the granting would be. Nor does the denial hinder the child's next petition, for he realizes that he WOULD HAVE HAD THE CAKE if he could without being made ill.

We need sometimes to realize this with God.

What, then, is prayer? It is the answer to God's prayer, for it is just the being reconciled to God, and so bringing our wants to Him as any child does to its parents; sure we shall get what we want, so far as love and willingness goes, but not sure so far as infinite knowledge and wisdom goes. But trusting that wisdom, and so loving and trusting God, whether He give, or whether He withhold.

EDWARD METCALFE.

Entre Nous.

German Spiritual Music.

Canon Scott Holland, who is Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, has been contributing papers on the War to the *Commonwealth*, of which he is the editor. These papers he has now collected into a volume with the title *So as by Fire* (Wells Gardner; 1s. net). There are Politics, Doctrine, Philosophy, and other things in them, and there is something else in this paper on

GERMAN SPIRITUAL MUSIC.

'There is only one thing to be done during this disastrous strife. Whenever you have read your papers, and have been reduced to a carnivorous fury by hideous tales of outrage and horror, you open your piano, and you begin to play tunes out of the most beautiful, and tender, and beseeching book in the whole wide world—"Das Deutsche Geistliche Lied"—the Collection of German religious music down the centuries. There are six little paper volumes of them—and they begin with a Hymn of Caelius Sedulius, with words by Martin Luther: and they come right down, through all the superb royalties of John Sebastian and Philip

Emmanuel Bach, to Schubert, and Mendelssohn, and friends of yesterday. Was there ever music like it, to wind into your very heart of hearts? These cuddling, crooning, Cradle-Songs in which Mary begs the dear Joseph to rock the child, or gather the hay for its pillow—they have in them the very soul of Germany—homely, motherly, sentimental, soft, delicious! There is song after song of this cradle-lilt: and, then, there are others which sing of Jesus, the babe, who will lie in our bosom, and be sung to sleep, with refrains of "Eia! Eia!" They seem to well up out of the very depth of loving motherhood. They rise and fall like a mother's breathing breast. They coo with the pleading sing-song of a brooding nurse. And, then, there are Shepherds calling to their goats, winning them by tender-hearted echoes to the safe sweet pastures. And there is solemn music from Hans Sachs, and Corner, and Crüger, for Sunday twilight over the wood fire: and folk-songs that have in them the strange soft pathos of buried peoples, who have lived in quiet forgotten places: and there is always Franck, and the great Sebastian, to kindle and to awe. It is a world of

peace: of home: of love: of pastoral joy: of a "family" religion that fills the house with its fragrance: of spiritual peasantry. No music compares with it for soothing crooning affectionate faithfulness to the God of the Hearth and the Jesus of the Cradle. As you play it, the Germany you had lost is found again, like the happy city under the Breton Sea, whose chiming bells Renan heard sounding through the green floods. This is the real Germany, and you love it: and your heart goes out to it: and you feel the blessing, as of an old mother, stirring about your head: and you are a child again, nestling inside the folds of granny's gown. How foolish and far-away, now, the rabid talk of your Treitschkies and Bernhardis! Away with them into the pit of forgetfulness! You have recovered your lost Allemagne.

'And, then, when we have got quite snug and comfy, and love our Deutschen friends, before we creep into bed, we had better just take down our John Morley—honest John! and read his lecture on "Machiavelli." It says the whole counter thing to Treitschke in a final and inimitable manner. It dismisses the Corsican conscience for ever. It puts us straight with the ultimate realities. It re-establishes our normal human nature on its sane ethical base. It disposes of sophisms. It clears the ground. It sweetens the air we breathe. It is absolutely healthy and convincing. We cannot relapse, after such a fortifying rally. We feel sure of ourselves. The moral law holds the field. It is the only interpretation of life which stands the pressure of facts. After all, was there ever so downright and catastrophic and damning a practical failure as the career of Cæsar Borgia on the lines of Machiavelli—except the career of the Corsican conscience with its piteous ending on the lonely rock, with the tortoises, at St. Helena? Is that a success that invites a following? Is that an end which justifies the means employed to arrive at it? Does it bewilder or intoxicate by its fascination? Good-bye, Corsican! Good-night, Treitschke! We can go one better than that.'

Ejaculatory Prayer.

The Committee of the Student Christian Movement has issued a small volume on *The Discipline of Prayer* (6d. net). It is an extremely attractive little book, both in its matter and in its outward form.

What *is* Prayer? 'Prayer is the reference of our lives to God. We refer the world of mind and

matter to Him and we adore. We refer our sins to Him and we confess. We refer our needs to Him and we make petition. We refer the needs of others to Him and we make intercession. We refer our blessings to Him and we give thanks.

'If prayer is different from all else it must follow that the prayerful life is different from the life in which there is no prayer. For if we do not refer our lives to God we unconsciously refer them to ourselves or to others. The result of this may be complacency or self-contempt; envy or exultation; satisfaction or remorse; despondency or excitement. But the result of referring our lives to God and viewing them in His presence will be such things as contrition, sense of pardon, aspiration, faith, assurance, acceptance of the will of God, caring for the good of others, peace, joy in the Holy Ghost; there will be other things, too, without a name, which nevertheless subtly operate among men just as nameless elements are potent in the world about us. The man who is possessed by the spirit of these emotions is a different man from him who is possessed by those others, and his quality is of a different value in the world. The prayerful life is therefore different from the prayerless life. It moves upon a different path and towards a different goal.'

The volume ends with a Plan of Prayer for a Week, and just before that an effort is made to encourage the use of Ejaculatory Prayer. Outside the Roman Church we do not take easily to Ejaculatory Prayer. This is what the unnamed author of this book says about it. 'The prayer-spirit may be kept alive through the day in the midst of the press of many duties if we sometimes send a very brief prayer winging its way to the throne of God. Such brief ejaculations as these have been found helpful:

Jesus!

All love, all glory be to Thee, O Lord.

Thy will be done!

God only.

My Lord is crucified.

Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?

Father, forgive me.

What Thou wilt; when Thou wilt; as Thou wilt; while Thou wilt.

'By some such utterance at any time of the day or night; in the midst of our business or of our pleasures; at the thought of a friend's need or of

our own weakness; on being confronted with a sudden difficulty or an overwhelming joy, or even when we are helpless in deliberate prayer—we may touch every incident of life with heaven and make even a grey and monotonous day flame with an unearthly glory.

'Regular prayer does not exclude ejaculatory prayer, nor does ejaculatory prayer make regular prayer unnecessary. Regular prayer is like the great reservoir of water up among the hills which supplies the pipes in thousands of homes many times a day. Reservoir and pipes are mutually dependent and helpful. The reservoir supplies the pipe, and the pipe sweetens the reservoir by preventing it from becoming stagnant. And reservoir and pipe are both ultimately dependent upon the gracious bounty of the rain from heaven.

'Our daily Bible-reading may become a most helpful source of this brief form of prayer if we store our memory with its phrases and use them to clothe our sudden thoughts and needs.'

Katharine Tynan.

Some poets have discovered themselves in the War. Some have discovered new depths in themselves. Katharine Tynan was a poet before the War began: her war poems are a discovery to herself and to us. The best known gives the book its title *Flower of Youth* (Sidgwick & Jackson; 3s. 6d. net). Copies of this poem may be bought separately (2½d. each, or a dozen for 2s. 1d.). Let us quote it here.

FLOWER OF YOUTH.

Lest Heaven be thronged with grey-beards hoary,

God, who made boys for His delight,
Stoops in a day of grief and glory

And calls them in, in from the night.
When they come trooping from the war
Our skies have many a new gold star.

Heaven's thronged with gay and careless faces,

New-waked from dreams of dreadful things,
They walk in green and pleasant places

And by the crystal water-springs
Who dreamt of dying and the slain,
And the fierce thirst and the strong pain.

Dear boys! They shall be young for ever.

The Son of God was once a boy.

They run and leap by a clear river

And of their youth they have great joy.

God who made boys so clean and good
Smiles with the eyes of fatherhood.

Now Heaven is by the young invaded;

Their laughter's in the House of God.
Stainless and simple as He made it

God keeps the heart o' the boy unflawed.
The old wise Saints look on and smile,
They are so young and without guile.

Oh, if the sonless mothers weeping,

And widowed girls could look inside
The glory that hath them in keeping

Who went to the Great War and died,
They would rise and put their mourning off,
And say: 'Thank God, he has enough!'

H. Rex Freston.

There is not a weak or worthless poem in Mr. Freston's collection which he calls *The Quest of Beauty* (Oxford: Blackwell; 1s. net). There is Wordsworthian simplicity, as in this:

GOD KNOWS.

So much sadness in the world!

Is the pleasure worth the pain?

Are our efforts all in vain?

Who can know and who can say?

Little children—such are we!

For the rest—it seems to me

God must know, and surely He

Will explain it all one day!

There is also the skill of the translator, as in this translation of President Poincaré's poem.

IN OLD LORRAINE.

Delicious odours are abroad!

The night air fills the heated train

With those cool scents which time hath stored

In the dim forests of Lorraine.

Greetings, fair land of health and grace!

Within thy borders dwell serene

Strong scions of the ancient race;

Of loyal heart and dauntless mien.

And every time that I return

Some new delight mine eyes can see;

Some shy surprise at every turn

My boyhood's home prepares for me.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.